

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

May. 12, 1962	Public Law 87-776 H. R. 10652	House passed H. R. 10652 which was referred to House Government Operations Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
May. 21, 1962		House committee failed to report H. R. 10652.
May. 29, 1962		House committee reported H. R. 10652 without amendment. H. Report No. 2617. Print of bill and report.
Apr. 3, 1962		House passed H. R. 10652 without amendment.
Apr. 3, 1962		H. R. 10652 was referred to the Senate Government Operations Committee. Print of bill as referred.
Sept. 18, 1962		Senate committee reported H. R. 10652 without amendment. S. Report No. 2209. Print of bill and report.
Sept. 28, 1962		Senate passed H. R. 10652 without amendment.
Oct. 9, 1962		Approved: Public Law 87-776.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 10652	1
Digest of Public Law 87-776	2

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

H. R. 10652
Public Law 87-776

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Index and summary of H. R. 10652
2.	Digest of Public Law 87-776

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 10652

ALLEGATIONS FOR VIOLATION OF HOUSE RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 86TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, ADMINISTRATIVE RECORDS AND OF 1962 TO 1963.

- Mar. 12, 1962 Rep. Ullman introduced H. R. 10652 which was referred to the House Government Operations Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
- Mar. 21, 1962 House committee voted to report H. R. 10652.
- Mar. 23, 1962 House committee reported H. R. 10652 without amendment. H. Report No. 1487. Print of bill and report.
- Apr. 2, 1962 House passed H. R. 10652 without amendment.
- Apr. 3, 1962 H. R. 10652 was referred to the Senate Government Operations Committee. Print of bill as referred.
- Sept. 28, 1962 Senate committee reported H. R. 10652 without amendment. S. Report No. 2185. Print of bill and report.
- Sept. 29, 1962 Senate passed H. R. 10652 without amendment.
- Oct. 9, 1962 Approved: Public Law 87-776.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 10652

Oct. 2, 1962	Approved: Public Law 87-776.	
Sept. 29, 1962	Senate passed H. R. 10652 without amendment.	
Sept. 28, 1962	Senate committee reported H. R. 10652 without amendment. 2. Report No. 2185. Print of bill and report.	
Apr. 3, 1962	H. R. 10652 was referred to the Senate Government Operations Committee. Print of bill as referred.	
Apr. 2, 1962	House passed H. R. 10652 without amendment.	
Mar. 23, 1962	House committee reported H. R. 10652 without amendment. H. Report No. 1487. Print of bill and report.	
Mar. 21, 1962	House committee voted to report H. R. 10652.	
Mar. 12, 1962	Rep. Ullman introduced H. R. 10652 which was referred to the House Government Operations Committee. Print of bill as introduced.	

ALLOWANCE FOR MOVEMENT OF HOUSE TRAILERS. Amends the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 so as to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings by Federal employees transferred from one official station to another. Retains the present limitation of 20 cents per mile when an employee chooses to move the trailer or mobile dwelling himself. Provides that if the trailer or mobile dwelling is moved by a commercial firm, or the employee's department or agency, the actual cost of moving may be paid by the Federal Government up to an amount which the employee would be entitled to receive for movement of his household and personal effects.

ALLOWANCES FOR MOBILE DWELLINGS

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
LAW LIBRARY
LEGISLATIVE REPORTING

HEARING
BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
ON

H.R. 10652 and H.R. 8049

A BILL TO AMEND THE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF
1946 TO PROVIDE A MORE REASONABLE MONETARY ALLOW-
ANCE FOR TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSE TRAILERS OR MOBILE
DWELLINGS BY CIVILIAN FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EM-
PLOYEES UPON THEIR TRANSFER FROM ONE OFFICIAL
STATION TO ANOTHER

MARCH 6, 1962

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Government Operations



COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Illinois, *Chairman*

CHET HOLIFIELD, California	CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Michigan
JACK BROOKS, Texas	R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York
L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina	GEORGE MEADER, Michigan
PORTER HARDY, Jr., Virginia	CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota	FLORENCE P. DWYER, New Jersey
ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama	ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan
EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland	GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, New Jersey
JOHN E. MOSS, California	ODIN LANGEN, Minnesota
JOE M. KILGORE, Texas	JOHN B. ANDERSON, Illinois
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida	RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin	F. BRADFORD MORSE, Massachusetts
ELIZABETH KEE, West Virginia	
KATHRYN E. GRANAHAH, Pennsylvania	
JOHN S. MONAGAN, Connecticut	
NEAL SMITH, Iowa	
RICHARD E. LANKFORD, Maryland	
ROSS BASS, Tennessee	
LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Michigan	

CHRISTINE RAY DAVIS, *Staff Director*
JAMES A. LANIGAN, *General Counsel*
MILES Q. ROMNEY, *Associate General Counsel*
HELEN M. BOYER, *Minority Professional Staff*
J. P. CARLSON, *Minority Counsel*

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Illinois, *Chairman*

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida	CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio
KATHRYN E. GRANAHAH, Pennsylvania	JOHN B. ANDERSON, Illinois
NEAL SMITH, Iowa	CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Michigan, <i>Ex Officio</i>
ELMER W. HENDERSON, <i>Counsel</i>	
VERONICA JOHNSON, <i>Clerk</i>	
IRENE MANNING, <i>Clerk</i>	

CONTENTS

Statement of:	Page
Congressman Al Ullman, statement read by Mrs. Mary Jane Yarrington.....	2
Mr. George Mullins, Bureau of the Budget.....	3
Dr. O. Glenn Stahl, Director, Bureau of Program and Standards, U.S. Civil Service Commission, accompanied by Mr. Raymond J. Mondor.....	9

H.R. 8049

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1962

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 1501, New House Office Building, Hon. William L. Dawson, chairman, presiding.

Present: Representatives Dawson, Smith, Brown, and Anderson.

Also present: Elmer W. Henderson, subcommittee counsel; and James A. Lanigan, general counsel, Committee on Government Operations.

Chairman DAWSON. A quorum now being present, the hearing will come to order.

We have before us this morning H.R. 8049, a bill introduced by our colleague, Congressman Ullman of Oregon, to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian Federal officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

(H.R. 8049 follows:)

[H.R. 8049, 87th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian Federal officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of subsection (b) of the first section of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such transportation" and inserting in lieu thereof "taking into consideration the current average costs for commercial transportation or the current average costs for transportation by the officer or employee, in lieu of the transportation to which he would otherwise be entitled under subsection (a)".

Chairman DAWSON. We have been advised that Mr. Ullman, who was scheduled to be our first witness, will not be able to join us. As all of you know, he suffered a severe accident recently and is recuperating from it. He did, however, send his secretary, Mrs. Mary Jane Yarrington, who will read Mr. Ullman's statement.

I may call to your attention the fact that this Congress has passed Public Law 87-374 relating to military personnel which has the same objective that H.R. 8049 has for civilian personnel. Copies of the law and the House and Senate Reports are in your folders.

Our first witness will be Mrs. Mary Jane Yarrington.

STATEMENT OF HON. AL ULLMAN

Mrs. YARRINGTON. Thank you, sir.

As most of you know, Mr. Ullman is back at work. But he is not able to take on a full work schedule yet. He is getting in a little later now and going directly to the Ways and Means Committee.

He did not want this committee to delay holding its hearing until he was up to taking on extra work. He asked that I read his statement.

(The statement of Hon. Al Ullman, read by Mrs. Mary Jane Yarrington, follows:)

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I want to thank you for your early scheduling of hearings on my bill to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers.

As I wrote your chairman, the Honorable William L. Dawson, last July, H.R. 8049 was introduced in response to a letter from a constituent who called my attention to the fact that the "reasonable" allowance provided in the present law for transportation of mobile homes was not actually reasonable but actually inequitable.

It would appear that the average cost of moving a house trailer in 1958, when the present law was passed, was already greater than the 20-cent limit imposed. A 1959 survey by the Department of Defense found that not one trailer, even in the smallest class, had been moved within the 20-cent limit. In fact, only 17 out of 1,820 trailers moved that year had been transported for 25 cents a mile.

The current average cost is close to 40 cents a mile and that figure does not include such required extras as bridge, road, and turnpike charges, permits, escort vehicles, and personal insurance on the trailer and its contents.

I am certain that members of this committee are aware of the changes which have taken place in the design of mobile homes. Average sizes have increased markedly and trailers can now be called homes. Not one of us would suggest that Federal employees are not entitled to a suitable home. Yet present transportation allowances could have the effect of restricting the choice of a dwelling which the employee might otherwise be able to provide for his family.

As the Civil Service Commission points out in its excellent report, many Federal employees reside in mobile homes not only through choice but because of the type of work they do. The trailer home is most admirably suited for construction sites, field testing stations, missile bases, and other isolated locations. In these instances, the trailer home is a convenience to the Government as well as the employee because it solves what otherwise could be a serious housing problem.

When an employee of the Federal Government is transferred and is entitled to transportation of his household effects, he should not, in my opinion, have to bear up to one-half the cost of moving simply because he lives in a trailer home rather than a conventional house. The multitude of evidence presented in the departmental reports would indicate that this is the present situation.

My purpose in introducing my bill was to bring this gross inequity to the attention of the Congress, and I am not wedded to the exact language of my bill. As a matter of fact, the change recommended by the Bureau of the Budget seems to me, on careful study, to be completely warranted, and I would support such a revision in the language.

As you know, the Bureau suggests that the legislation be amended to authorize reimbursement for the actual amounts which employees are required to pay for such transportation if that cost is not in excess of the maximum amount to which the employee would be entitled for transportation of household effects. I heartily concur and hope that this committee will draft and approve language to implement the Bureau's suggestion.

I, of course, also approve of the Bureau's recommendation that District of Columbia employees be included in this bill and feel confident the committee will make this necessary change. Since regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission require payment for the transportation upon acceptance at destination, I would further urge the committee to provide for advance payment to an employee in those instances where he himself contracts for the movement of his trailer.

Again may I thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of this legislation.

Chairman DAWSON. Mr. Brown, would you like to ask the witness any questions?

Mr. BROWN. No.

Chairman DAWSON. She is representing our colleague, Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Brown. I think the statement is very well prepared.

Do we have other witnesses?

Chairman DAWSON. Yes. We have witnesses from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BROWN. I will wait until we hear the other witnesses.

Chairman DAWSON. Thank you very much, Mrs. Yarrington.

Mrs. YARRINGTON. Thank you, sir.

Chairman DAWSON. You have convinced us all by your eloquence.

Mr. BROWN. Perhaps Mr. Ullman is a better legislator than the rest of us. He knows who to send.

Mrs. YARRINGTON. Thank you, sir.

Chairman DAWSON. Mr. George Mullins of the Bureau of the Budget will be our next witness.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE MULLINS, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. MULLINS. I do not have a prepared statement, gentlemen. But I do have some comments that I could make. Most of them are almost the same as you have already heard from Mrs. Yarrington.

We do have a few technical suggestions regarding the content of the bill. But at the outset, I would like to make it clear that those are technical suggestions and are in no way intended to question the basic purpose of the bill.

We are very much in favor of the bill. We believe the bill is necessary. Employees are being required to pay a substantial portion of the cost of transporting their house trailers. At present, the minimum cost under ICC-approved tariffs for the smallest kind of a trailer is 29 cents per mile.

That is 9 cents above the present statutory maximum. Then, in addition to that, as the previous witness pointed out, the employee must pay State permit fees which vary by the States. They are \$11 in some instances.

The Department of Defense estimates that the average of those fees is about \$30 per move. As I say, that is for the smallest kind of trailer. Trailers can be rather large now. And the ICC-approved tariff for a trailer 58 feet long and 11 feet wide is 85 cents per mile, or more than four times the present statutory maximum.

Beyond that size, the tariffs now provide that the rate increases by 1 cent per mile for each foot of increased length in the trailer beyond 60 feet. Now, that inequity, we feel, is further compounded by the fact that if the employee chose not to live in a trailer, he could have his household goods moved at Government expense up to a statutory maximum of 7,000 pounds.

And in most instances, the amount of that allowance would exceed substantially the amount for moving of the house trailer, even the actual cost of moving the house trailer.

Mr. SMITH. Do you have any figures on that?

Mr. MULLINS. Yes, we have some typical examples, such as taking a trip from Washington, D.C., to Kansas City or Washington, D.C., to Los Angeles, which I will give you.

I will now go to the suggested amendments to the bill.

The first one does not need much time. It has already been mentioned by Mrs. Yarrington. It is that the purpose clause of the bill be amended by deleting the word "Federal" so that it would include employees of the District of Columbia government. The present statute includes those employees.

Mr. BROWN. Why do you think that you ought to include the District of Columbia employees? You don't send them very far away.

Ninety percent of them who work out at Laurel, as mentioned here, drive anyway. They wouldn't give up their homes.

Mr. MULLINS. We would anticipate the number of moves of District of Columbia Government employees to be very small. It would involve Lorton, the correctional institution at Lorton, and so on.

Mr. BROWN. How far away are they now? They are all within driving distance of the District of Columbia. Half of the people working in the District of Columbia live as far away as Lorton.

Mr. MULLINS. My home is in Lorton.

Mr. BROWN. Well, then, you know what I mean.

Mr. MULLINS. That is true. There would be only a rare case where an employee would move his home because of a transfer from, we will say, Lorton to Laurel. But that distance could be 50 or 60 miles.

Mr. BROWN. Under the social security setup over in Baltimore, half the people who work over there, I suspect, commute between here and Baltimore.

Mr. MULLINS. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. I don't think they are interested in having trailers over in Baltimore.

Mr. MULLINS. I doubt first that there would be very many employees of the District of Columbia Government who would be moving their domiciles because of transfer to these outlying areas from Virginia and Maryland.

Secondly, I doubt if very many of those who do change their domiciles live in trailers. So, we are talking about a very small detail.

Mr. BROWN. I know. But we are opening the door.

Mr. MULLINS. The only reason that I made the proposal is that the present statute as it has stood for some years does include the District of Columbia. And we thought perhaps it was just inadvertently left out in the language of Congressman Ullman's bill. We have had no correspondence from the District of Columbia Government taking any position on this matter.

Our second suggestion for modifying the bill is that it be amended to provide for the payments to be based upon the actual tariffs as approved either by the ICC or by a similar internal State regulatory body rather than based on averages as the language of the bill now provides.

Averages can be used where the spread between the minimum and the maximum is not too great. We do base some allowances on that type of arrangement.

But in this instance you have for a small trailer a limit of 29 cents per mile; whereas, for a large one, it could be 85 cents per mile, or even more.

That would mean that under a system based on averages in any given case the employee would either be paid more than he deserved or much less than he deserved. We think in this case this is a bill that is designed to do right by the individual rather than a matter of just averages.

We have language drafted which would accomplish the change we are recommending which we can submit to Mr. Henderson for the committee's consideration.

Along with that change, we are recommending that the bill allow the payment of these toll charges, tunnel charges, bridge fees, and State permit fees which are added to the ICC tariffs.

Also in that connection, we are suggesting that no immediate change be made in cases where the employee moves his own trailer using his own personal car. That is more or less limited now to smaller size trailers. The big ones require a truck.

At present, an allowance of 11 cents per mile is made for the movement of the trailer plus the mileage allowance to which the employee is entitled for the movement of his vehicle. This statutory maximum on the vehicle is 12 cents a mile. So, it would be 12 cents maximum, plus 11 cents, or a total of 23 cents per mile in those cases. Keeping in mind that these are small trailers so far as we can determine, that amount is adequate for the present.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I interrupt with a question?

In other words, under this bill, where somebody moves their own trailer, why, you would continue this 23 cents a mile payment?

Mr. MULLINS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is only where they actually have a common carrier transporting the trailer for them that they would be recompensed according to whatever the tariff was?

Mr. MULLINS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I see.

Mr. BROWN. Let me ask one question. Do you think there should be some limitation as to the length of time that an employee should be employed in a new location?

Mr. MULLINS. This thought had not occurred to me before. But it would seem to me that if an employee is occupied in, we will say, a geological survey and is moving from one mineral test site to another, if the Government has ordered him to move, then he should be entitled to the allowance.

If he is just moving because of some personal reason such as health or convenience, or what have you, then he would not be entitled to any allowance.

Mr. BROWN. The law does not say that, does it?

Mr. MULLINS. No, not this bill.

Mr. BROWN. The law now provides that?

Mr. MULLINS. The Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, yes.

Mr. BROWN. Suppose a man down at Lorton gets a job over at Laurel for a month, and he says, "Mother, we will just have to move the trailer over there. It would be nicer to do that than to drive back and forth for a month," then what? Maybe the Government ordered him over there to fill in for a month. Or suppose they need him for some other reason and he is transferred, just as they might send you out on a case.

Mr. MULLINS. I don't believe that that would be considered a permanent change of station for only 30 days or 60 days. It would be temporary duty.

He would be entitled to a per diem. He would be put on travel status for that kind of situation.

Mr. Brown. I understand that.

Now, these men on the geological surveys are not at a permanent station either, but you say they could be moved from place to place.

Mr. MULLINS. Yes. They could be moved from place to place, yes. They could be moved to somewhere in the desert where they are making mineral tests.

Mr. BROWN. We have had a number of these employees in Ohio recently where they spend 30 to 45 days making a survey in a county. Most of those people have their own cars and stay at local hotels or motels. Could they use these trailers and move from one place to another every 30 or 40 days as they progress across the State or across several States?

Mr. MULLINS. The only way they could do that would be if they were ordered by their agency to a new post of duty.

Mr. BROWN. Somebody orders these geological survey teams to change the places from which they are working, which are closer to the center of activity. Whenever they finish or conclude their activities in that area, they move to the next station. It may be mapped out for 2 or 3 years in advance as far as I know.

Mr. MULLINS. I believe that the governing factor there would be the administrative officer of the agency figuring which way the Government comes out the best.

In other words, if that employee collects a \$16 per diem for his travel expenses, that expense should be balanced off against the cost of transferring him from one station to another, which would depend on how long he stayed at a given place.

Mr. BROWN. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. BROWN. On the record again.

Chairman DAWSON. I am pleased to see that you are interested in seeing that we meet the expenses of our public servants and Government servants. I remember they objected to a slight raise in the fees paid to them for their cars, and so forth. I am glad to see they have had a change of heart. And I hope now that the employees of the Government will not be put to personal expense in performing Government business.

Mr. MULLINS. Shall I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman DAWSON. Yes, please.

Mr. MULLINS. One more suggestion that we have for modifying the bill would establish a maximum to the allowance so that the employee would not be entitled under this bill to a payment larger than the amount he could receive if he transported his household goods.

Now, that point never came up in the past because the 20 cents maximum allowance was so much less than the employee could have obtained if he moved his household goods that there never was any problem. Now, however, if this bill is enacted, the allowances for movement of a house trailer would be high enough so that in some instances it could be greater than the cost of moving 7,000 pounds of household goods between the same two points.

We do not think that the Government should be required to pay more than the amount to which the employee would be entitled under the present statute for the movement of household goods if he transferred from a permanent home to another home.

Now, as an example, to show what this would amount to, a large trailer being transferred from Washington, D.C., to Kansas City, Mo., a distance of about 1,061 miles, would be \$902 plus the additional charges for these State fees and turnpike charges and so forth.

Mr. SMITH. On that point: when they calculate what it costs for common transportation, doesn't one include these fees?

Mr. MULLINS. No.

In other words, the tariffs that I am mentioning are base tariffs. Then those fees are on top of that.

Mr. SMITH. If one employs a common carrier to take one's trailer to a certain point, does the common carrier bill for so much according to what he is allowed to, and does he add those fees on top of that?

Mr. MULLINS. That is right. Sometimes a city will have a fee that it charges for every trailer that goes through its boundaries.

Mr. SMITH. I sought the common carriers had a rate by years.

Mr. MULLINS. I don't believe so.

Mr. SMITH. I see.

Mr. MULLINS. Now, if the employee had moved his household goods rather than a trailer between those same two points, the charges would have been \$819 or a difference of \$83 in that case. And the effect of what we are suggesting is that the Government would not pay that \$83 difference.

To take another example, a trip between Washington, D.C. and Los Angeles, the maximum trailer allowance for a very large trailer would be \$2,292; whereas, the commuted rate for the household goods would be only \$1,361. So, there would be a substantial difference there.

Now, keep in mind this is for an extremely large trailer costing 85 cents a mile.

Mr. BROWN. How do you get from Washington to Los Angeles by highway in less than 2,000 miles?

Mr. MULLINS. This would be about 2,696 miles, I believe, the way this is figured. This is based on the Highway Guide distance between the two points.

Now, the final comment that I will make will be on the cost effect of this.

I want to say that we are not at all proud of our cost information. We have no figures showing the relative size of the trailers that employees own. We do not have what we consider to be reliable figures on the actual number of trailers all through the Government. Nor do we have reliable data on the frequency with which those employees move the trailers.

We are still trying to get some better information on that. There are a few indicators which I can mention for what they are worth.

First, I would like to point out the statement in the report by the Civil Service Commission where they have described a test made by the Federal Aviation Agency. That test, as their report to your committee states, covered 15,000 employees, or a little less than one-third the total staff in that agency. And out of that, about three-tenths of 1 percent moved by trailer in 1 year. And two-thirds of

that number used commercial transportation, or commercial common carriers to move their trailers.

So, we are concerned with about two-tenths of 1 percent of the employees in that particular agency.

On that basis, the total number of trailers moved might be something less than a thousand moves per year. The FAA test indicated that the costs under the present law were about \$4,500, and that the employees in addition to that paid about \$4,400 out of their own pockets.

Now, on that basis, if that test is valid for the Government as a whole—and we do not know that—the total cost would be a few million dollars a year, about \$4 million a year. We are still attempting to obtain better information on that. And we will supply it to the committee if we can.

We do not anticipate that any of these increases would involve an increase in appropriations.

That concludes my comments.

Chairman DAWSON. That last statement was a nice conclusion to end your statement on, that it won't increase the appropriations.

Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. No questions.

Chairman DAWSON. Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. I am not clear yet about this reference to the word "averages." As I understand the bill, it provides that employees would be paid average costs for commercial transportation. Are you saying that it should be the actual cost, whatever that is?

Mr. MULLINS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. What if they secure a common carrier that charges more than some other common carrier they could have gotten?

Mr. MULLINS. Well, the common carriers are controlled by the rates that are filed with the ICC.

Mr. SMITH. They have a minimum?

Mr. MULLINS. Yes. In other words, it is the same as a railroad freight rate.

Now, your point would be valid if the employee were moving within a State so that he used a carrier who was not interstate and who, therefore, would be subject to a ratemaking body within that State rather than the ICC. There could be differences then.

We have the same problem on the movement of household goods within a State and outside of a State. And we have to establish commuted rates, which take those into consideration.

Mr. SMITH. According to what you are saying now, the word "average" neither adds nor detracts, because they are all the same.

Mr. MULLINS. We interpreted the word "average" to mean that this was to be an average rate for the movement of a trailer between any two specific points. And we challenged that, because a small trailer would take one rate and a big trailer would take another rate.

And we thought that the employee who moved a small trailer should be paid only the tariff for moving of a small trailer; whereas, if he had a large trailer, he should get the appropriate amount for that rather than some average in between the two.

Chairman DAWSON. Mr. Anderson?

Mr. ANDERSON. No questions.

Chairman DAWSON. Thank you very much, sir.

Our next witness will be Dr. O. Glenn Stahl, Director of the Bureau of Programs and Standards, U.S. Civil Service Commission, accompanied by Mr. Raymond J. Mondor.

STATEMENT OF DR. O. GLENN STAHL, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF PROGRAM AND STANDARDS, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, ACCOMPANIED BY RAYMOND J. MONDOR

Dr. STAHL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, the main interest of the Civil Service Commission in this bill is the same as the Commission's interest in other kinds of legislation which involve reimbursement of employees for expenses that they incur in the course of their duties.

We naturally feel that in order to recruit and retain the kind and quality of personnel that the Government needs, we should not penalize employees by requiring them to pay for expenditures that have to be made because of work done at the convenience of the Government rather than at their own convenience.

Consequently, the Commission has expressed itself as favoring this bill and its objectives. We, of course, would also endorse the amendments that have been proposed by the Bureau of the Budget.

Our report, Mr. Chairman, to your committee was dated December 14, 1961. And if you should care to, you might wish to place this report in the record. I might just add one or two points beyond those that have already been stated so as to clarify a little bit what kinds of situations exist where employees find it almost necessary or at least convenient to live in house trailers.

In addition to some of the places mentioned, like the Geological Survey, there is the Coast and Geodetic Survey; there are field testing stations and laboratories in the Department of Defense at missile bases and elsewhere where employees have to be moved from time to time, and their locations are away from metropolitan centers or any towns at all in most instances.

The Weather Bureau, Bureau of Public Roads, Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers in the Army, as well as the Federal Aviation Agency, and I think even the Bureau of Indian Affairs, are examples of some of the Government agencies in which employees are engaged who find it practically necessary, due to working conditions, to use a house trailer.

We found also from some of the information that we gathered that, considering the variety of sizes of trailers, the rates per mile tend to run in the neighborhood of 50 cents when you count in the cost of turnpike tolls, ferry charges, and local charges of the type that have already been referred to.

So, this is a far cry from the 20 cents limit that exists in the present law, if this average is correct. It is reported by a couple of sources. One was the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio as to what they pay their field employees who are so situated, and another is the Morgan Drive-Away Corp., which is one of the large firms that specializes in hauling private trailers.

Both of them reported a general average of about 50 cents a mile. This is a far cry from the 20 cents limit that exists in the present law. Therefore, we heartily endorse the objectives of the bill and the specific amendments that have been proposed.

Chairman DAWSON. Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. No questions.

Chairman DAWSON. Mr. Anderson?

Mr. ANDERSON. No questions.

Chairman DAWSON. Thank you very much, sir.

Dr. STAHL. Thank you, sir.

Chairman DAWSON. That concludes the hearing on H.R. 8049.

We have with us today Mr. Vaughn from the Air Force. We are pleased to have had you with us.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

(Whereupon, at 11 a.m., the subcommittee proceeded to consideration of H.R. 8596.)



87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10652

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 12, 1962

Mr. ULLMAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations

A BILL

To amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the last sentence of subsection (b) of the first section
4 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C.
5 73b-1) is amended by striking out "to a reasonable allow-
6 ance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such trans-
7 portation" and inserting in lieu thereof, "in lieu of the
8 transportation to which he would otherwise be entitled under

1 subsection (a) of this section, to a reasonable allowance, not
2 to exceed 20 cents per mile for transportation of the house
3 trailer or mobile dwelling if such trailer or dwelling is trans-
4 ported by such officer or employee, or, if such trailer or
5 dwelling is not so transported by such officer or employee, to
6 commercial transportation of the house trailer or mobile
7 dwelling, at Government expense, or reimbursement to such
8 officer or employee therefor, including the payment of neces-
9 sary tolls, charges, and permit fees, except that no payment
10 under this sentence shall exceed the maximum payment to
11 which such officer or employee would otherwise be entitled
12 under this section for transportation and temporary storage
13 of his household goods and personal effects in connection with
14 this transfer”.

A BILL

To amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

By Mr. ULLMAN

MARCH 12, 1962

Referred to the Committee on Government Operations

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited).

Issued March 22, 1962
For actions of March 21, 1962
87th-2d, No. 42

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	21,33	Foreign aid.....	18	Monopolies.....	28
Budgeting.....	3,32	Foreign currencies.....	7	Peace Corps.....	12,15,34
Conservation.....	14	Foreign trade.....	6,10,27	Personnel.....	5,23
Crop insurance.....	8	Forest products.....	25	Public debt.....	20
Disaster loans.....	22	Government-business compensation.....	11	Research.....	4
Education.....	21	Holiday.....	29	Soybeans.....	31
Electrification.....	30	Imports.....	6,24	Starch.....	6
Farm labor.....	13	Item veto.....	32	Surplus property.....	26
Farm program.....	1,13	Lands.....	19	Tapioca.....	6
Feed grains.....	2	Legislative program.....	9	Travel.....	5
Flood insurance.....	17			Unemployment.....	15,27

HIGHLIGHTS: Rep. Latta criticized farm bill. House Rules Committee cleared bill to permit summer fallow lands to participate in feed grains program.

HOUSE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Latta criticized the provisions of H. R. 10010, the Administration's farm bill, saying, "the American farmer has done nothing to call for the enactment of such punitive legislation." pp. 4352-3
2. FEED GRAINS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of S. 2533, to permit farmers in summer fallow areas to receive barley, corn, and grain sorghum price support and to participate in the corn and grain sorghum diversion program provided they reduce their corn and grain sorghum acreage to the extent necessary to bring their acreage of corn, grain sorghum, and barley down to not more than 80 percent of the 1959-60 average of those three crops. p. 4369
3. BUDGETING. The Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10613, to repeal subsection (d) of sec. 16 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946 which requires detailed budget estimates for appropriations to be used for purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles or for purchase, maintenance, or operation of aircraft. p. D196

4. RESEARCH. The Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6984, to provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at universities, colleges, and other educational institutions. p. D196
5. PERSONNEL; TRAVEL. The Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10652, to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another. p. D196
6. TAPIOCA; STARCH. Rep. Curtis, Mo., discussed his bill H. R. 10823, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide quota limitations on imports of duty-free tapioca and to provide for a tariff on additional imports, saying, "The domestic starch producers are in a vulnerable position because the United States has no tariff while the other major countries do." pp. 4351-2
7. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Received from various committees reports on their expenditures of foreign currencies and appropriated funds for travel outside the U. pp. 4356-69
8. CROP INSURANCE. Received from the Comptroller General a report on the audit of FCIC for 1961 (H. Doc. 368). p. 4369
9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that S. 2533, to amend the requirements for participation in the 1962 feed grain program, will be considered on Thurs. p. 4340

SENATE

10. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Javits discussed the "need for a personal campaign by President Kennedy to explain the issues underlying the trade policy debate," and inserted several items on the foreign trade issue. pp. 4280-1
Sen. Smith, Mass., inserted a report by the New England Council for Economic Development, "The Trade Expansion Program and Its Meaning for New England." pp. 4294-7
11. GOVERNMENT-BUSINESS COMPETITION. Sen. Towers stated that "the Federal Government is in many areas and on many fronts in active competition with private business," and urged a lessening of Government-business competition. pp. 4267-71
12. PEACE CORPS. Sen. Javits inserted a National Lutheran Council resolution commending the Peace Corps. p. 4281

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Chipperfield inserted an editorial commending the Farm Bureau's cropland adjustment plan, "Farm Bureau Plan Merits Trial." p. A2169
Rep. Norblad inserted an editorial critical of the Administration's farm bill, "An Enemy of the People?" pp. A2183-4
Rep. Thornberry inserted an article by the County Agent in Washington County, Tex., defending agricultural price supports, "County Agent Doubts Farm Aid and Controls Socialistic." pp. A2195-6
Rep. Gathings inserted an article defending the Mexican farm labor program, "The Case for Braceros." pp. A2159-61

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued March 27, 1962
For actions of March 23, 1962
87th-2d, No. 46

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....28	Government operations....15	Saline water.....12
Animal disease.....17	Industrial uses.....16	Soviet agriculture.....10
Appropriations.....2	Lands.....27	Sugar.....25
ASC committees.....19	Loans.....6	Taxation.....22
Budgeting.....4	Patents.....7	Travel.....5
Casein.....31	Pay systems.....29	Water resources....13
Cooperatives.....11	Personnel.....5,21,29	Water pollution.....26
Farm program.....1,18	Postal rates.....20	Watersheds.....8
Flood relief.....33	Potatoes.....28	Wheat.....1
Foreign trade.....24,31	Recreation.....30	Wilderness.....23
Forestry.....9,32	Research.....3	Wildlife.....14

HIGHLIGHTS: House subcommittee voted to report committee print on wheat section of farm bill. House committee reported (Mar. 25) Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Sen. tennis introduced and discussed bill to increase authorization for nationwide forest survey.

HOUSE

1. FARM PROGRAM; WHEAT. The "Daily Digest" states that the Subcommittee on Wheat of the Agriculture Committee "ordered reported favorably, with amendment, Committee Print No. 2, regarding the wheat section of H. R. 10010, the general farm bill." p. D208
2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported on Mar. 23 (during adjournment of the House) H. R. 10904, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for 1963 (H. Rept. 1488). p. 4589
3. RESEARCH. The Government Operations Committee reported on Mar. 23 (during adjournment of the House) without amendment H. R. 6984, to provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at universities, colleges, and other educational institutions (H. Rept. 1485). p. 4589

4. BUDGETING. The Government Operations Committee reported on Mar. 23 (during adjournment of the House) without amendment H. R. 10613, to repeal subsection (d) of sec. 16 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 which requires detailed budget estimates for appropriations to be used for purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles or for purchase, maintenance, or operation of aircraft (H. Rept. 1486). p. 4589
5. PERSONNEL; TRAVEL. The Government Operations Committee reported on Mar. 23 (during adjournment of the House) without amendment H. R. 10652, to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another (H. Rept. 1487). p. 4589
6. LOANS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments H. R. 946, to extend to oyster planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provide for production disaster loans for farmers and stockmen (H. Rept. 1502). p. 4589
7. PATENTS. Received from Commerce a proposed bill "To provide for public notice of settlements in patent interferences"; to Judiciary Committee. p. 4589
8. WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture Committee approved the following watershed and flood prevention plans: Gum Neck watershed, North Carolina; Pine Creek watershed, Tennessee; northeast tributaries of Leon River watershed, Texas; and Wagon Creek watershed, Oklahoma. p. 4579

SENATE

9. FORESTRY. Sens. Stennis, Allott, and Hill commended the service of Richard E. McArdle, former Chief of the Forest Service, upon his retirement, and Sen. Stennis inserted an editorial commending his service, "Protector of Forests." pp. 4608-9
10. SOVIET AGRICULTURE. Sen. Miller inserted an article on Soviet agricultural policy, "What K.'s Decision on Farms Implies," stating that "A huge new agricultural bureaucracy is to be established in the rural regions to harass and encourage the collective farmers. But no increase of state investments in farming is to be made." p. 4601
11. COOPERATIVES. Sen. Miller inserted an article on the recent growth and development of farm cooperatives, stating that this Department is "working up several study proposals designed to foster more big co-ops that would go beyond traditional local and regional lines." pp. 4601-2
12. SALINE WATER. Sen. Kuchel commended the accomplishments of the saline water conversion program and inserted his remarks at the dedication of the Point Loma saline water conversion plant at San Diego, Calif. pp. 4592-3
13. WATER RESOURCES. Received a N. Y. Legislature resolution memorializing Congress to authorize a review of plans for the multipurpose development of the Genesee River Basin, N. Y. pp. 4591-2
14. WILDLIFE. Sen. Kuchel urged enactment of legislation to give congressional sanction to the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge Area in Calif. and Ore. pp. 4593-4

AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946

MARCH 23, 1962.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. DAWSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 10652]

The Committee on Government Operations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 10652) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 10652, a clean bill in lieu of H.R. 8049, is to provide a more reasonable method of determining an allowance for the transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings of civilian officers or employees of the Federal Government when they are transferred from one official station to another.

Under present law the transportation allowance for such mobile homes is limited to 20 cents per mile. Under the bill, the employee may be reimbursed the actual cost of moving the trailer if it is moved by a commercial firm; or, if his department or agency contracts to move it, the agency will be authorized to pay the actual cost of moving. However, these payments may not exceed the maximum to which the employee would be entitled under existing law for the movement of his household and personal effects. Further, the present limitation of 20 cents per mile would remain if the employee chose to move the trailer himself.

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill is designed to remove an inequity in the law providing for the transportation of house trailers and mobile homes. Under the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-1) the Government is authorized to provide employees who possess such trailers an allowance up to 20 cents per mile for their transportation from one official station to another. House trailers have grown in size and weight in recent years and many of them are too large or too heavy to be moved by being attached to a passenger car. Trucks are required and commercial firms do most of the moving. Rates for transporting mobile homes across State lines are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Because of the increase in size, many communities require a police escort which must be paid for and there are other fees and tolls which add to the expense.

Evidence was given the committee that the cost of moving the larger trailers varied anywhere from 29 to 85 cents per mile. In order to move his home when he is transferred by the Government an employee is required, because of the 20-cent-per-mile limitation, to pay the excess out of his own pocket.

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization at which time representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission were present and supported the bill.

During his testimony the Budget Bureau representative stated:

We are very much in favor of the bill. We believe the bill is necessary. Employees are being required to pay a substantial portion of the cost of transporting their house trailers. At present, the minimum cost under ICC-approved tariffs for the smallest kind of a trailer is 29 cents per mile.

That is 9 cents above the present statutory maximum. Then, in addition to that, as the previous witness pointed out, the employee must pay State permit fees which vary by the States. They are \$11 in some instances.

The Department of Defense estimates that the average of those fees is about \$30 per move. As I say, that is for the smallest kind of trailer. Trailers can be rather large now. And the ICC-approved tariff for a trailer 58 feet long and 11 feet wide is 85 cents per mile, or more than four times the present statutory maximum.

Beyond that size, the tariffs now provide that the rate increases by 1 cent per mile for each foot of increased length in the trailer beyond 60 feet. Now, that inequity, we feel, is further compounded by the fact that if the employee chose not to live in a trailer, he could have his household goods moved at Government expense up to a statutory maximum of 7,000 pounds.

And in most instances, the amount of that allowance would exceed substantially the amount for moving of the house trailer, even the actual cost of moving the house trailer.

The Civil Service Commission representative testified that—

We found also from some of the information that we gathered that, considering the variety of sizes of trailers, the rates per mile tend to run in the neighborhood of 50 cents when you count in the cost of turnpike tolls, ferry charges, and local charges of the type that have already been referred to.

So, this is a far cry from the 20-cent limit that exists in the present law, if this average is correct. It is reported by a couple of sources. One was the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio as to what they pay their field employees who are so situated, and another is the Morgan Drive-Away Corp., which is one of the large firms that specializes in hauling private trailers.

Both of them reported a general average of about 50 cents a mile. This is a far cry from the 20-cent limit that exists in the present law.

Other departments and agencies reporting on the bill by letter all favored its enactment, some presenting data on employee cost experience in moving trailers. Copies of the reports are contained in the appendix.

The committee noted that this Congress has passed legislation giving relief to military personnel who possess mobile homes: Public Law 87-37.4 The formula adopted is different from the one proposed in this bill but the objectives are the same. Undoubtedly, this Congress wishes to remove the same inequity for civilian personnel that it has already accomplished for military personnel.

No precise figures are available on the total cost of this legislation on a Government-wide basis but the Bureau of the Budget reported that it did not anticipate any increase in appropriations.

This committee feels it is most likely that Government employees who live in house trailers or mobile homes do so more because of the exigencies of their employment than because they prefer to do so. These are primarily personnel who are stationed in areas remote from large population centers, where housing is difficult to obtain, where transfers are frequent or where circumstances are far less convenient than for the majority of workers. They certainly deserve our consideration. Only a relatively small number would be affected by this bill and, hence, we see little likelihood of abuses occurring under its provisions.

It should be noted that the bill does not enlarge the class of employees entitled to reimbursement for moving their families and household effects from one post of duty to another. Such reimbursement is now and still would be limited to cases where the transfer is for permanent duty and is in the interest of the Government.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italics*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in *roman*):

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946

AN ACT

To authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) under such regulations as the President may prescribe, any civilian officer or employee of the Government who, in the interest of the Government, is transferred from one official station to another, including transfer from one department to another, for permanent duty, shall, except as otherwise provided herein, when authorized or approved by such subordinate official or officials of the department concerned as the head thereof may designate for the purpose, be allowed and paid from Government funds the expenses of travel of himself and the expenses of transportation of his immediate family (or a commutation thereof in accordance with the Act of February 14, 1931) and the expenses of transportation, packing, crating, temporary storage, drayage, and unpacking of his household goods and personal effects (not to exceed seven thousand pounds net weight): *Provided*, That advances of funds may be made to the officer or employee in accordance with said regulations under the same safeguards as are required under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926 (5 U.S.C. 828): *Provided further*, That the allowances herein authorized shall not be applicable to officers and employees transferred in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That no part of such expenses (including those of officers and employees of the Foreign Service, Department of State) shall be allowed or paid from Government funds where the transfer is made primarily for the convenience or benefit of the officer or employee or at his request: *Provided further*, That in case of transfer from one department to another such expenses shall be payable from the funds of the department to which the officer or employee is transferred; and *Provided further*, That expenses of travel and transportation in connection with the transfer of officers and employees to posts of duty outside the continental limits of the United States and return therefrom shall be allowed to the same extent and subject to the same limitations prescribed for new appointees under section 7 of this Act.

(b) In lieu of the payment of actual expenses of transportation, packing, crating, temporary storage, drayage, and unpacking of household goods and personal effects, in the case of such transfers between points in continental United States, reimbursement shall be made to the officer or employee on a commuted basis (not to exceed the amount which would be allowable for the authorized weight allowance) at such rates per one hundred pounds as may be fixed by zones in regulations prescribed by the President. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, any civilian officer or employee who transports a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, for use as a residence and who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of household goods and personal effects under subsection (a) shall be entitled [to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such transportation] *in lieu of the trans-*

portation to which he would otherwise be entitled under subsection (a) of this section, to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile for transportation of the house trailer or mobile dwelling if such trailer or dwelling is transported by such officer or employee, or, if such trailer or dwelling is not so transported by such officer or employee, to commercial transportation of the house trailer or mobile dwelling, at Government expense, or reimbursement to such officer or employee therefor, including the payment of necessary tolls, charges, and permit fees, except that no payment under this sentence shall exceed the maximum payment to which such officer or employee would otherwise be entitled under this section for transportation and temporary storage of his household goods and personal effects in connection with this transfer.

* * * * *

APPENDIX

REPORTS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES ON H.R. 8049

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., December 12, 1961.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for a report on H.R. 8049, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian Federal officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

The existing statutory maximum allowance of 20 cents per mile for transportation of a house trailer is substantially less than the amounts actually charged by commercial concerns for such services under published tariffs approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. In fact the actual rates charged may be more than double the statutory maximum, depending upon the size and type of trailer involved, routing, and other factors.

We believe employees who live in trailers should not be required to finance a substantial part of their moving expenses when they are requested to transfer to new duty stations, especially since employees who live in permanent homes may be reimbursed for moving their household goods in amounts which frequently exceed the cost of moving house trailers. We therefore support the purpose of H.R. 8049 to repeal the existing statutory maximum and substitute a more flexible basis to reimburse employees for costs of moving trailers.

Instead of paying on the basis of averages as the bill provides, however, we suggest that the bill be amended to authorize reimbursement for the actual amounts which employees are required to pay including State permit charges and other fees as well as the standard tariff rates as indicated by receipted bills. The reason for this recommendation is that the range of low and high rates is so great that use of averages as a basis for reimbursement would result in large over-

payments to some employees while other employees would still be required to finance a substantial portion of their moving expenses. Furthermore averages would be difficult to compute because, in addition to the basic tariffs which vary from 25 cents to 50 cents per mile depending upon the weight of the trailer being moved, there are many supplemental charges imposed for trailers of various dimensions and for State permits and various fees.

Under existing regulations, when an employee elects to use his own automobile for transporting a trailer, he may receive 11 cents per mile for the movement of the trailer plus a mileage allowance for the use of his automobile (maximum 12 cents per mile), a total maximum of 23 cents per mile. We believe these allowances are adequate for the present but that authority should exist to adjust them upward or downward so that amounts reimbursed will equal approximately the costs incurred.

It would be possible for the costs of moving an unusually large and heavy trailer to exceed the amount to which an employee who does not live in a trailer would be entitled for transportation of his household goods. Under existing legislation an employee may be reimbursed for transportation of not more than 7,000 pounds of household goods. We believe the bill should be amended to limit the allowance for transportation of a house trailer to the maximum amount which may be paid for the transportation of household goods of employees who do not live in house trailers.

Finally, we recommend a minor change in the purpose clause of the bill. Persons covered are described as "civilian Federal officers and employees," thereby excluding employees of the District of Columbia who may be employed at such institutions as the Glendale Hospital, the Children's Center at Laurel, the correctional organizations at Occoquan and Lorton, Va., or within the District of Columbia. Although transfers between these locations may be rare and would not always necessitate change of domicile, we believe the bill should be amended in order that the allowances should continue to be available to employees of the District on the same basis as Federal employees.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., December 15, 1961.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of July 17, 1961, requesting our comments on H.R. 8049, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian Federal officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

This Department believes that the present maximum rate of 20 cents per mile is too low to permit reasonable reimbursement to employees for costs of moving house trailers used as residences, when required to change official stations. A recent survey by this Depart-

ment of employee costs of transporting house trailers by commercial haulers supports this conclusion. The survey revealed that in practically all cases, the present allowable rate of 20 cents per mile was substantially under the rates paid by the employee. Rates paid were found to vary from 17 to 75 cents per mile, depending upon length, width and weight of the trailer, distance traveled, nature of terrain (mountainous or flat), and State or States involved.

The following is a summary of cost data disclosed by our survey:

Agency	Cases reported	Cost to employees	Reimbursement to employees	Excess cost not reimbursed	Percent not reimbursed
1.-----	3	\$142.22	\$101.40	\$40.82	29
2.-----	36	3,728.25	2,011.93	1,716.32	46
3.-----	21	3,983.18	1,956.40	1,936.78	50
4.-----	47	6,478.44	3,561.40	2,917.04	45
5.-----	12	2,510.47	1,505.80	1,004.67	40
Total-----	119	16,752.56	9,136.93	7,615.63	45

The allowances permitted an employee for the movement of a house trailer on change of station are in lieu of allowances for movement of household goods and personal effects to which he would otherwise be entitled under 5 U.S.C. 73b-1(a). In the interest of equability to such employees and simplicity of administration to the Government, we recommend that allowances permitted for movement of house trailers by commercial haulers be based on actual cost to the employee, not to exceed the amount to which he would otherwise be entitled for movement of 7,000 pounds of household goods under 5 U.S.C. 73b-1(b) as implemented by Executive Order 9805, as amended. Also, we recommend that the present method of reimbursement on a rate per mile basis be continued for the employee who elects to move his house trailer other than by commercial hauler.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 1, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request to the Secretary of Defense for the views of the Department of Defense with respect to H.R. 8049, 87th Congress, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian Federal officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another. The Secretary of Defense has delegated to the Department of the Air Force the responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense.

The purpose of H.R. 8049 is as stated in the title. A monetary allowance, not in excess of 20 cents per mile, for the transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings for civilian employees is provided in section 1b, Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-1). The proposed legislation would amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide an allowance based on "the current average costs for commercial transportation or the current average costs for transportation by the officer or employee, in lieu of the transportation to which he would otherwise be entitled."

During the past few years, significant advances have taken place in the production and design of trailer housing and mobile homes. The size of the mobile home has expanded to the point where many of the new units are 10 feet wide and 50 feet long and it is no longer practical for the owner to tow his mobile home with his automobile. These larger, heavier units require special equipment and handling by experienced personnel, making it mandatory that they be towed commercially.

The tariff rates per mile for hauling a trailer vary with its length, width and weight. These rates range from 22 cents to 55 cents per mile. It is estimated that the current average rate is 38 cents per mile. In view of these findings, the present limitation of 20 cents a mile is obviously unrealistic and has resulted in considerable out-of-pocket expense for the mobile home owner who uses commercial means of transportation. On the other hand, the civilian employee who occupies a fixed home is entitled to move a maximum of 7,000 pounds net weight of household effects at Government expense. (The employee is required to pay any costs in excess of this authorized allowance.) The following, using estimated averages, is cited as an example of this inequitable situation:

Employee with trailer hauled commercially for a distance of 800 miles:

ICC tariff rate (average), 38 cents per mile times 800.....	\$304
Average expense for tolls, State fees and charges.....	30

Total cost.....	334
Reimbursed by Government at rate of 20 cents per mile.....	160

Out-of-pocket cost to employee.....	174
Employee without trailer shipping average amount of household goods a distance of 800 miles: Using an average weight of 4,000 pounds the commuted rate reimbursement by the Government under schedule A, Executive Order 9805 is (\$9.80 times 40).....	392

It is pertinent to note that the enactment of Public Law 87-374 provided a more equitable allowance for members of the uniformed services who transport house trailers upon permanent change of station. H.R. 8049 would provide similar benefits to the civilian employees of the Federal Government. It would preclude the necessity for a civilian employee to pay a share of the cost of moving his mobile home, out-of-pocket, when he is transferred from one official duty station to another for the convenience of the Government.

For the foregoing reasons, the Department of the Air Force, on behalf of the Department of Defense, strongly recommends enactment of H.R. 8049.

An estimate cannot be made of the cost of the proposed legislation, if enacted, since information is not available as to the number of employees owning house trailers who would have a permanent change of

station. It is believed, however, that the number of such individuals is small and that the added cost would be insignificant. In any event, payment of the trailer allowance would normally be less than the cost of shipping an employee's household goods and personal effects.

This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the committee.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1961.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DAWSON: This is in further reply to your letter of July 17, 1961, requesting a report on H.R. 8049, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian Federal officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

H.R. 8049 would remove the statutory ceiling of 20 cents per mile allowance for transporting house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian employees upon their transfer from one official station to another, and provides for reimbursement to be based on current average costs.

The Civil Service Commission heartily endorses H.R. 8049, and recommends its enactment both as a matter of equity for employees and as a matter of good administrative practice for Government.

Public Law 85-326, approved February 12, 1958, established the 20-cent rate. Only 3 years later, it has been asserted that this rate is unrealistically low—about 30 cents below the average rate for movement of an average sized trailer by commercial transporters. To obviate the necessity for further legal amendments in the future, if these costs continue to rise, we endorse the language in H.R. 8049 to delete reference in the law to a monetary limitation, thus relying on administrative regulations to establish separate allowances for movement of trailers by commercial transporters and for movement of the trailer by employees. Such allowances could be revised periodically based upon results of studies made to determine current average costs.

A recent survey of about 15,000 of Federal Aviation Agency's 40,000 employees disclosed that, in 1960, 49 employees who were relocated for the convenience of the Government arranged for movement of their house trailers. Thirty-four of these 49 transferees hired a commercial transporter to move the trailer to the new duty station. Information furnished by the 49 employees shows that the Federal Government reimbursed these employees for the movement of their trailers a total of \$4,569. The information also shows, however, that the move cost the employees an additional \$4,466, which was not reimbursable, or an average net loss of over \$90 per move.

The Mobile Housing Carrier Conference reports that the average size house trailer today is of the following dimensions:

Height: 11 feet, 6 inches.

Weight: 9,500 to 10,500 pounds.

Length: 43 to 45 feet.

Width: 10 feet.

Growth in the size of trailers makes it increasingly impractical to move them with private passenger vehicles and has made obsolete any unstated assumption in payment plans that this would be the normal method. The increasing use of the more accurate name "mobile home" in place of "trailer" reflects this development.

Tariff rates established by the large commercial transporters and on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission for moving a trailer of this size average 41 cents per mile. This does not include other extra charges paid directly by the Federal employee. These include bridge, road, and turnpike tolls, ferry and tunnel charges, taxes, permits, cost of securing permits (now required in 40 States), cost for escort vehicles required by some States, and personal insurance on trailer and its contents for the trip. With these additional charges, the average rate to move the average size trailer, according to Morgan Driveaway, Inc. (one of three large firms specializing in this business) becomes 50 cents per mile. Standard Oil Co. of Ohio reports that they pay their field employees who move by trailers in the neighborhood of 50 cents per mile.

Many Federal employees reside in house trailers through choice. However, the Federal service employs civilians in many positions where it has been found most convenient for all concerned for the employee and his family to reside in a house trailer. These include, for example, construction inspectors and engineers with the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Public Roads, and Bureau of Reclamation; electronics technicians of Weather Bureau and Federal Aviation Agency who install and repair electronic equipment at outlying and isolated locations; field survey parties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and scientific, technical, and other Defense Department employees residing in trailers at field testing stations and laboratories, and at missile bases.

Inadequate allowances for movement of trailers are likely to have an adverse effect on the recruiting and retention of employees in all governmental units whose activities require a very mobile work force.

We feel that any increased cost of allowances for movement of house trailers would be greatly, if not completely, offset by—

- (1) A more mobile and flexible work force;
- (2) A more satisfied group of employees;
- (3) Less turnover, with resulting savings in recruitment and training costs;
- (4) Less need to provide Government living quarters at temporary sites;
- (5) Less occasion to make more expensive payments for movement of household goods for employees who dispose of their trailers, if their work situation permits, rather than continue to absorb losses.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr., *Chairman.*

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, August 18, 1961.

B-130421

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of July 17, 1961, acknowledged July 18, requests our comments on H.R. 8049 to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian Federal officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

Section 1(b) of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as added by the act of February 12, 1958, 72 Stat. 14, 5 U.S.C. 73b-1(b), presently provides that under regulations prescribed by the President, any civilian officer or employee who transports a house trailer or mobile dwelling for use as a residence and who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of household goods and personal effects shall be entitled to a reasonable monetary allowance of "not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such transportation." H.R. 8049 would delete the present 20 cents per mile limitation and instead would authorize a monetary allowance "taking into consideration the current average costs for commercial transportation or the current average costs for transportation by the officer or employee," in lieu of the transportation costs of household goods and personal effects to which otherwise entitled.

Since the contemplated allowance is authorized in lieu of transportation costs of household goods and personal effects otherwise authorized on change-of-duty station, we suggest that a provision be included to the effect that such allowance may not in any case exceed the cost to the Government for the shipment of the maximum weight of household goods and personal effects permitted by law (7,000 pounds net weight—see sec. 301(c) of Public Law 86-707, amending sec. 1 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, 74 Stat. 796) for the individual concerned between his old and new duty station.

The terms "current average costs for commercial transportation" and "current average costs for transportation by the officer or employee" are not defined in the proposed legislation. We are not aware of the basis for computing "current average costs" of such transportation by the officer or employee, and some guideline in the legislation may be desirable. Also, it may be noted that rates for commercial movement of house trailers and mobile dwellings between places in the United States are published in Mobile Housing Carriers Conference Freight Tariff No. 1-E, MF-I.C.C. No. 9.

We direct your attention to H.R. 2732, 87th Congress, as amended, and favorably reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on

July 11, 1961, House Report No. 688, relating to transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings upon permanent change of station by members of the uniformed services.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, January 2, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request of July 17, 1961, for a report on H.R. 8049, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian Federal officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

The bill would amend section 1(b) of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, 5 U.S.C. 73b-1(b), to provide that in determining allowances for civilian employees for the transportation of house trailers in connection with a change of station, the current average costs for commercial transportation or the current average costs for transportation by the officer or employee shall be taken into consideration. The present maximum of 20 cents per mile would be removed.

We have received a number of complaints regarding the inadequacy of the present maximum allowance of 20 cents per mile from employees who have transported house trailers by commercial arrangement. Although the rates set by the Interstate Commerce Commission permit commercial carriers to charge a mileage rate according to weight and size of the trailer, civilian employees are nevertheless paid only a flat mileage rate without regard to weight and size. We therefore believe that the existing law should be amended to provide a more equitable allowance for employees who transport house trailers by commercial means.

Because of the variation in the cost of such transportation depending upon weight and size of trailer as well as the difficulties of determining average costs, we are in accord with the recommendation made to your committee by the Bureau of the Budget in its report of December 12, 1961, that H.R. 8049 should be amended to authorize reimbursement for the actual expenses incurred by an employee in transporting a house trailer for use as a residence but not in excess of the maximum allowance for the transportation of household goods and effects of employees without such trailers.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Assistant Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., December 22, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. DAWSON: This responds to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 8049, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian Federal officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

We recommend the enactment of the bill.

Presently, a Federal officer or employee may be reimbursed at a rate "not to exceed 20 cents per mile" for expenses incurred in the transportation of a house trailer or a mobile dwelling when such officer or employee is transferred from one official station to another. H.R. 8049 would remove the present 20-cents-per-mile limitation and authorize the President to prescribe regulations for reimbursement "taking into consideration the current average costs for commercial transportation or the current average costs for transportation by the officer or employee * * *."

Under existing law, employees who are transferred from one station to another are authorized within certain weight limitations to move their household effects at Government expense. The weight allowances usually are adequate for the normal household effects. Thus, the shipment involves no out-of-pocket expense to the employee.

Employees who live in house trailers or other mobile homes (usually they have no recourse because of isolation and lack of housing) do not have a similar benefit of full payment for transportation of household effects. They are limited to a 20-cents-per-mile reimbursement where the house trailer is transported by commercial hauler. Any amount paid commercial haulers over and above this allowance must be absorbed by the employee.

The Bonneville Power Administration of this Department has reported to us that rates in the Pacific Northwest for the transportation of house trailers range from 25 cents to 60 cents per mile, depending on the size of the trailer. To these basic rates other charges are added, such as \$10 to \$20 for hookup, 10 cents per mile for deadheading the towing tractor back to its point of origin, and 15 cents per mile for a pilot car when one is required by State highway regulations. Accordingly, employees of the Bonneville Power Administration usually cannot recover the actual cost of moving house trailers on changes of official station in the Pacific Northwest. We presume that transportation rates and charges in one section of the country would generally reflect the rates and charges made by the industry nationally.

We believe that the new language proposed to be inserted in the present act would be more clearly stated as follows: "taking into consideration the current average costs for commercial transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings or the current average costs to officers and employees for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by privately owned vehicles, in lieu of the transportation to

which the officers and employees would otherwise be entitled under subsection (a)."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

○

Union Calendar No. 629

87TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 10652

[Report No. 1487]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 12, 1962

MR. ULLMAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations

MARCH 23, 1962

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the last sentence of subsection (b) of the first section
4 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C.
5 73b-1) is amended by striking out "to a reasonable allow-
6 ance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such trans-
7 portation" and inserting in lieu thereof, "in lieu of the
8 transportation to which he would otherwise be entitled under

1 subsection (a) of this section, to a reasonable allowance, not
2 to exceed 20 cents per mile for transportation of the house
3 trailer or mobile dwelling if such trailer or dwelling is trans-
4 ported by such officer or employee, or, if such trailer or
5 dwelling is not so transported by such officer or employee, to
6 commercial transportation of the house trailer or mobile
7 dwelling, at Government expense, or reimbursement to such
8 officer or employee therefor, including the payment of neces-
9 sary tolls, charges, and permit fees, except that no payment
10 under this sentence shall exceed the maximum payment to
11 which such officer or employee would otherwise be entitled
12 under this section for transportation and temporary storage
13 of his household goods and personal effects in connection with
14 this transfer”.

87TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 10652

[Report No. 1487]

A BILL

To amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

By Mr. ULLMAN

MARCH 12, 1962

Referred to the Committee on Government Operations

MARCH 23, 1962

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

HOUSE

April 2, 1962

17. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported (on Mar. 30) H. R. 11038, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1962 (H. Rept. 1548), which includes items for ARS, AMS, and Forest Service (see table at end of this Digest for a summary of these items). The bill also includes \$25,000,000 for disaster relief assistance to States and local governments, \$17,000,000 for U. S. participation in the New York World's Fair, \$18,000 for salaries and expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, \$5,000,000 additional capital for the GSA general supply fund to provide for increased sales, and \$85,000,000 increased capital for the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration.
Conferees were appointed on H. R. 10526, the Treasury-Post Office Departments and Executive Office of the President appropriation bill (p. 5060). Senate conferees have already been appointed.
Received from the President an amendment to the budget for 1963 involving an increase of \$6 million for the civil functions of the Department of the Army (H. Doc. 378). p. 5160
Received from the President amendments to the budget for 1963 involving a net decrease of \$265,000 for civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army (H. Doc. 379). p. 5160
18. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Subcommittee on Dairy and Poultry of the Agriculture Committee "ordered reported favorably to the full committee title III /on marketing orders/ (amended), of H. R. 10010, the general farm bill. Also ordered reported subtitle C /on dairy/ (amended), of title IV, without recommendation." p. 5235
19. LIVESTOCK DISEASES. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 860, to grant the Secretary of Agriculture additional authority to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry. pp. 5121-4
20. PERISHABLE COMMODITIES. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 1037, to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act regarding fees, oral hearings, and relicensing. pp. 5124-6
1. SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. At the request of Rep. Ford, passed over without prejudice H. R. 8962, to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act. p. 5061
22. FORESTRY. Passed with an amendment H. R. 9822, to provide that lands within a national forest acquired under section 8 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest. p. 5061
23. WILDLIFE. Passed as reported H. J. Res. 489, to provide protection for the golden eagle. pp. 5062-6
24. HONEYBEES. Passed without amendment H. R. 8050, to prohibit the importation of all honeybees of the genus *Apis* in the adult stage except for research purposes by this Department or as the Secretary shall determine. p. 5078
25. WEIGHTS AND MEASURES. At the request of Rep. Gross, passed over without prejudice H. R. 2049, to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the U. S. of the metric system of weights and measures. p. 5061

26. LOANS. Passed as reported H. R. 946, to extend to oyster planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provides for production disaster loans for farmers and stockmen. pp. 5078-9
27. FOREIGN TRADE. On objection of Rep. Curtis, Mo., passed over H. R. 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to authorize the President to extend import-export controls to non-participants in multilateral cotton textile agreements. pp. 5079-80
28. RESEARCH. At the request of Rep. Ford, passed over without prejudice H. R. 6984, to provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at universities, colleges, and other educational institutions. pp. 5080-1
29. BUDGETING. Passed without amendment H. R. 10613, to repeal subsection (d) of section 16 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 which requires detailed budget estimates for appropriations to be used for purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles or for purchase, maintenance, or operation of aircraft. p. 5081
30. PERSONNEL; TRANSPORTATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 10652, to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another. p. 5081
31. BANKING. By a vote of 255 to 94, passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 10162, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U. S. to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system. pp. 5086-99
32. RECREATION. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 1171, to increase the public benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas through their incidental or secondary use for public recreation. pp. 5099-102
33. TERRITORIES. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 10062, to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa including extension of the provisions of the National School Lunch Act to Samoa, and authorizing the head of any Federal department to extend to American Samoa, without reimbursement, such scientific, technical, and other assistance under any program which it administers as, in the judgment of the Governor, will promote the welfare of American Samoa (pp. 5127-8). The committee report includes the following statement regarding costs: "The bill provides for no increase in authorized appropriations. The amount of aid which may be requested under section 1 of the bill is limited to \$150,000 a year ... Other items in the bill will be charged to regular departmental appropriations as need occurs."
34. EDUCATION. The Education and Labor Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10896, the proposed Adult Basic Education Act of 1962 (H. Rept. 1551). p. 5161

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

35. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Findley stating that "an \$86 million assist to the U. S. gold problem is possible as the result of new Public Law 480 agreements which utilize a new feature of the law." pp. A2509-10

limitation applies only to grants. Many people are shifting away from the grant approach and using the contract approach, because there is no limitation on the contracts. This whole proposition is under investigation by the Committee on Government Operations. I am in favor of that investigation. I think it will bring out a great deal of information which will have a bearing on the handling of these matters.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The information that we already have is that 6.6 percent was too much.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that there is a great deal of interest and some controversy in this area and bearing this situation in mind, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ELIMINATING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN DETAILED ESTIMATES IN ANNUAL BUDGETS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10613) to eliminate the requirements for certain detailed estimates in the annual budgets.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note in the report that this bill is for the purpose of eliminating from the President's annual budget certain detailed data on the purchase, hire and use of passenger motor vehicles. I also note in the report on page 2 where it is stated that there will be a reduction in printing of about 25 pages. On page 6, if I can read correctly, it says it will be a reduction of five pages. I wonder which it is?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. We were told it would be 25 pages in the President's budget report. However, they will have to notify the Committee on Appropriations and give them a detailed list; 25 pages is the amount we were told.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Is the Cadillac brigade listed in the 5 or 25 pages? Are the chauffeur-driven Cadillacs and the person to whom they are assigned, listed?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In this 25 pages, as you well know, are listed all of the cars the various agencies purchase. Instead of putting it into the budget, it is being put in the report given to the Committee on Appropriations and any Member of Congress who wants it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman still has not answered my question. Is the Cadillac brigade listed by car and whether it is chauffeur driven and to whom it is assigned? Could we get that information; can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. This particular 25 pages, I understand, lists the cars and the agencies that they were purchased for.

Mr. GROSS. But not to whom the cars are assigned; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do not believe that is in the present budget.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman's committee can be helpful, since this report is to be made available to Members, in finding out to whom the Cadillacs and the Lincoln Continentals and the Chrysler Imperials are assigned, and whether they are chauffeur driven? This brigade is growing by leaps and bounds. I find it more and more difficult in driving to work to make my way through the Cadillac brigade. I would appreciate any information I can get.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do not think this has anything to do with getting the names of the chauffeurs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended by section 16 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73(d)) is repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING MORE REASONABLE ALLOWANCE FOR TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSE TRAILERS OR MOBILE DWELLINGS BY CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10652) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of subsection (b) of the first section of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-1) is amended by striking out "to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such transportation" and inserting in lieu thereof, "in lieu of the transportation to which he would otherwise be entitled under subsection (a) of this section, to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile for transportation of the house trailer or mobile dwelling if such trailer or dwelling is transported by such officer or employee, or, if such trailer or dwelling is not so transported by such officer or employee, to commercial transportation of the house trailer or mobile dwelling, at Government expense, or reimbursement to such officer or employee therefor, including the payment of necessary tolls, charges, and permit fees, except that no payment under this sentence shall exceed the maximum payment to which such officer or employee would otherwise be entitled under this section for transportation and temporary storage of his household goods and personal effects in connection with this transfer".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOLUNTARY OVERSEAS AID WEEK

The Clerk called the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) requesting the President to designate the week of March 25, 1962, as "Voluntary Overseas Aid Week."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I simply want to comment that this is the first legislation that I can remember that has come to the floor of the House since I have been a Member of this body, dealing with foreign aid or having to do with aid to foreigners that has not called for millions or billions of dollars. I am delighted that we are making this record here today. I believe it is the first bill that does not call for a huge appropriation for foreigners.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas United States voluntary agencies have participated actively in international social and economic development efforts in many countries; and

Whereas the Government of the United States and its people have endorsed and supported the efforts of these agencies to provide varied types of assistance over a large area of the world; and

Whereas the people-to-people concept of assistance typified in the programs of these agencies is a reflection of American good will and our belief in human dignity and the democratic way of life; and

Whereas it is the declared policy of the Congress to encourage the continued contribution of these agencies in the less developed countries through their various programs of technical assistance and relief: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that people-to-people programs administered by nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with the Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid evidence our friendship for peoples in other lands.

The President of the United States is requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike the "Whereas" clauses. On page 2, line 7, strike "March 25, 1962", and insert "April 9, 1962".

Amend the title to read as follows: "Requesting the President to Designate the Week of April 9, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALIDATION OF PAYMENT OF CERTAIN ALLOWANCES, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10195) to validate payments of certain special

station per diem allowances and certain basic allowances for quarters made in good faith to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, here is another of these bills correcting someone's mistake. I want to find out exactly who is responsible. It seems that some 60 people are going to get a windfall to the tune of an average of about \$600 each. I wonder if some member of the committee which handled this bill could tell me who was responsible for making this mistake?

Mr. LANE. I would like to answer the gentleman's inquiry by stating that of course the Department followed the procedure that has been carried on for a good many years, as I understand, and just continued where payments had been made until these new quarters were built. This, after all, validates these special per diem allowances for quarters and basic allowance for quarters on Indian Health facilities, and this legislation, as the gentleman well knows, was recommended to us by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As the gentleman from Iowa says, it relieves a group of 67 Public Health officers of repayment of money they received as allowance for quarters in the way it had been followed down through the years but which some clerk who wrote the report declared to be improper because new quarters had been provided.

This bill recommends this procedure. The Bureau of Accounts has declared that the overpayments were invalid. All this happened back a few years ago. The amount, as is explained in the report is \$40,562. We have only been able to collect about \$2,000 of this amount from these Public Health officers. It was felt that to relieve them of this payment would help to build up the morale of these Public Health officers who for the most part are working in Alaska and other remote areas.

Mr. GROSS. I have followed the gentleman's statement. I read all that in the report. He still is not coming anywhere close to answering my question. Will the gentleman tell us who made this mistake and what is being done about it?

Mr. LANE. I am sorry to say to the gentleman that we do not know who made the mistake.

Mr. GROSS. Did you not ask? Did you not have hearings? Did you not seek to find out who made the mistake?

Mr. LANE. We did not have hearings. It came to us in the form of an executive communication.

Mr. GROSS. Is this the way you treat all executive communications? Just take them for what they appear to be on the surface or on paper?

Mr. LANE. No. I may say to the gentleman that on many, many occasions we hold hearings, of course. But in this one particular case because of the fact that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare felt these men should be relieved of this payment we have gone along. As I say, these men for the most part are employed in these remote areas.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman that I do not want any group of

people, Public Health officers, or others to profit personally from mistakes made at the expense of the taxpayers of this country: This type of thing is costing the taxpayers thousands, hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of dollars every year. I think you ought to bring these people in here and find out who is responsible for making the mistake in the first instance. It is high time someone began to take an interest in this Government and its operations.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I am somewhat surprised that the Committee on the Judiciary seemed to be so anxious to help the Public Health Service out of this predicament. Why should these people be relieved of their indebtedness any more than the sailor, the airman, or the soldier whom some paymaster overpays? If this bill passes, these Public Health Service men are given relief but the many others in the Armed Forces are hounded to death.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman from Michigan has finished his statement.

Mr. LIBONATI. I understand he has.

Mr. FORD. I want to say right here and now that I intend to ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice. There seems to be an inequality of treatment. As soon as this Department comes in and asks for relief for its employees because of an error by the Department, there is some affirmative legislative action taken, but if there is a poor single individual who is confronted with the problem of repayment through no fault of his own, he gets no consideration whatsoever. I am sick and tired of the various departments being bailed out; and as far as I am concerned, this legislation can rest on the Consent Calendar for a long time.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Unfortunately, in this specific instance there were no accommodations in Alaska that could be used for the ordinary purposes, so they were placed in lesser accommodations. The costs there are significantly higher than in other places. These men were placed under better conditions, with private families in some instances, and naturally the costs increased. I think the gentleman should withdraw his objection.

Mr. FORD. There is a basic question here, which is the failure of somebody in the administration of the Public Health Service to realize overpayments were being made.

Mr. LIBONATI. But we should not penalize the officers who had to take these accommodations as they were provided.

Mr. FORD. Then the question asked is pertinent, Who was responsible and what happened to him?

Mr. LIBONATI. I will say the Department itself through the disbursing officer.

Mr. FORD. Let us find out who the disbursing officer is.

Mr. LIBONATI. That would not give the gentleman the right to object to a bill which is for the purpose of providing equity in a case.

By this action, the gentleman from Michigan prejudices the interests of U.S. health officers who were ordered to Alaska by assignment of the Public Health Service, whereat housing and living conditions unbeknown to them was either inadequate as to normal accommodations, or the costs were in excess of the statutory limit of the remuneration allowed to them under the statutes, which were insufficient to meet these costs. The Health Administration approved the added costs under these emergency conditions. And now you refuse to permit these added costs to be waived against their personal accounts and assumed by the Government. Your objection prevents the committee from dealing equitably in this matter and charge this added expense, where it belongs, to our Government.

Mr. FORD. Let us take one thing at a time.

Mr. LIBONATI. It is easy for the gentleman to object. It is difficult for us to understand that after receiving testimony in executive session and passing favorably on this bill for presentation on the floor and have the gentleman take an economic position that is not a popular one in accordance with the disposition of similar legislation in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me say just this: These people are Public Health officers and they went from quarters for which they were paying rental into rent-free quarters. It is hard for me to believe anyone could go from quarters for which they paid rent into quarters on which there was no rental and not know it. This is pretty hard for me to understand. This I would like cleared up before I vote for this bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I would like to clarify the record and say this specifically to the gentleman from Michigan, that the Committee on the Judiciary has had numerous bills whereby we have forgiven debts of this character. This is not discriminatory legislation in favor of the employees of this particular division. We have done this many times.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Who is responsible for this overpayment?

Mr. LANE. I have already answered that. There is nothing that we have in our record to show that. As I have already stated, it went on and on. It had previously been done for a good many years. I want to answer the gentleman by saying that they paid rent. The question was presented to officers occupying the new quarters, and they prescribed the difference between the rental charges paid and the basic allowance for the quarters received as valid payments.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, there was a difference, and that is the reason

87TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 10652

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 3, 1962

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Government Operations

AN ACT

To amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the last sentence of subsection (b) of the first section
4 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C.
5 73b-1) is amended by striking out "to a reasonable allow-
6 ance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such trans-
7 portation" and inserting in lieu thereof, "in lieu of the
8 transportation to which he would otherwise be entitled under

1 subsection (a) of this section, to a reasonable allowance, not
2 to exceed 20 cents per mile for transportation of the house
3 trailer or mobile dwelling if such trailer or dwelling is trans-
4 ported by such officer or employee, or, if such trailer or
5 dwelling is not so transported by such officer or employee, to
6 commercial transportation of the house trailer or mobile
7 dwelling, at Government expense, or reimbursement to such
8 officer or employee therefor, including the payment of neces-
9 sary tolls, charges, and permit fees, except that no payment
10 under this sentence shall exceed the maximum payment to
11 which such officer or employee would otherwise be entitled
12 under this section for transportation and temporary storage
13 of his household goods and personal effects in connection with
14 this transfer”.

Passed the House of Representatives April 2, 1962.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

APRIL 3, 1962

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Government Operations

forestry research by providing grants and other assistance for forestry research to land-grant colleges and universities or agricultural experiment stations, was passed as reported on Sept. 25, and passed the bill without amendment. (pp. 20021-3) This bill will now be sent to the President. Rejected the committee amendments which would have made all colleges and universities offering graduate training in the sciences basic to forestry and having forestry schools eligible for grants under the bill without regard to whether they are State supported. (p. 20023)

13. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration with amendments this bill, H. R. 12580. p. D907
14. BUDGETING. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H.R. 10613, to repeal subsection (d) of Sec. 16 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 which requires detailed budget estimates for appropriations to be used for purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles or for purchase, maintenance, or operation of aircraft (S. Rept. 2184). p. 19997
15. PERSONNEL. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H.R. 10652, to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another (S. Rept. 2185). p. 19997
Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 12180, to extend until July 1, 1964, the existing provisions of law permitting the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the U. S. under Government orders. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 20082
16. MINERALS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 1696, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of federally-owned lands for the purpose of locating strategic minerals (S. Rept. 2188). p. 19997
17. D. C. APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Passed as reported this bill, H. R. 12276. Conferees were appointed. pp. 20025-78
18. DRUGS. Conferees were appointed on S. 1552, the proposed Drug Industry Act of 1962. House conferees have already been appointed. pp. 20078-82
19. WILDERNESS PRESERVATION. Sen. Humphrey defended the wilderness preservation bill as passed by the Senate and urged the House to take action on the measure this session of Congress. pp. 20097-9
20. RECLAMATION. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 1060, to authorize the construction of the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Wash. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 20085-6
21. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Jackson defended the provisions of S. 3153, to define the primary marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration, as passed by the Senate Aug. 8. pp. 20086-8
22. PEACE CORPS. Sen. Humphrey commended the work of the Peace Corps on its first anniversary. pp. 20094-7
23. FOREIGN AID. The Rules and Administration Committee reported a resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document a study, "United States Private

Foreign Aid Programs." p. 19997

24. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield stated that the foreign aid appropriation bill will be considered next Mon., Oct. 1, following by consideration of the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill, the public works appropriation bill, and the roads bill, and that the conference report on the tax bill will probably be considered Wed., and the supplemental appropriation bill will probably be considered on Thurs. pp. 20011-3

SENATE - Sept. 29

25. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 12900. pp. 20114, 20115, 20118-43, 20149, 20156, 20168-237
26. STATE-COMMERCE-JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Sen. Smathers submitted notice that he will move to suspend the rules on this bill, H. R. 12580, for the purpose of proposing amendments to it. pp. 20102-9
27. FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Sens. Smathers and Hayden submitted notices that they will move to suspend the rules on this bill, H. R. 13175, for the purpose of proposing amendments to it. p. 20109
28. WATER POLLUTION. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10617, providing that the U. S. district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain cases involving pollution of interstate river systems, and providing for the venue thereof (S. Rept. 2211). p. 20102
29. EDUCATION. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendment S. 3477, to promote the security and welfare of the people of the U. S. by providing for a program to assist the several states in further developing their programs of general university extension education (S. Rept. 2204). p. 20102
30. PERSONNEL. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8140, to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest (S. Rept. 2213). p. 20102
Passed without amendment H. R. 10652, to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another so as to provide that the employee may be reimbursed the actual cost of moving the trailer if it is moved by a commercial firm or his agency contracts to move it. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 20153
31. MINERALS. Passed as reported H. R. 11049, to provide for the relief of certain oil and gas lessees under the Mineral Leasing Act. pp. 20149-51
32. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Passed without amendment H. R. 11378, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to schools for the mentally retarded, schools for the physically handicapped, educational television stations, and public libraries. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 20153-4
33. ADJOURNED until Mon. Oct. 1. p. 20237

AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF
1946

SEPTEMBER 28, 1962.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 10652]

The Committee on Government Operations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 10652) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

This bill would amend section 1 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-1) to provide for a more reasonable allowance for the transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government when they are transferred from one official station to another.

The bill would retain the present limitation of 20 cents per mile when an employee chooses to move the trailer himself. It provides, however, that if his mobile home is moved by a commercial firm, or is moved by his department or agency, the actual cost thereof may be paid by the Federal Government, in which event, the latter payments may not exceed the maximum to which the employee would be entitled under existing law for movement of his household and personal effects.

BACKGROUND

The House Committee on Government Operations in its report on the bill (H. Rept. 1487), sets forth the following background and justification for the proposed legislation, which is made a part of this report:

This bill is designed to remove an inequity in the law providing for the transportation of house trailers and mobile homes. Under the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-1) the Government is authorized to provide employees who possess such trailers an allowance up to 20 cents per mile for their transportation from one official station to another. House trailers have grown in size and weight in recent years and many of them are too large or too heavy to be moved by being attached to a passenger car. Trucks are required and commercial firms do most of the moving. Rates for transporting mobile homes across State lines are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Because of the increase in size, many communities require a police escort which must be paid for and there are other fees and tolls which add to the expense.

Evidence was given the committee that the cost of moving the larger trailers varied anywhere from 29 to 85 cents per mile. In order to move his home when he is transferred by the Government an employee is required, because of the 20-cent-per-mile limitation, to pay the excess out of his own pocket.

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization at which time representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission were present and supported the bill.

During his testimony the Budget Bureau representative stated:

"We are very much in favor of the bill. We believe the bill is necessary. Employees are being required to pay a substantial portion of the cost of transporting their house trailers. At present, the minimum cost under ICC-approved tariffs for the smallest kind of a trailer is 29 cents per mile.

"That is 9 cents above the present statutory maximum. Then, in addition to that, as the previous witness pointed out, the employee must pay State permit fees which vary by the States. They are \$11 in some instances.

"The Department of Defense estimates that the average of those fees is about \$30 per move. As I say, that is for the smallest kind of trailer. Trailers can be rather large now. And the ICC-approved tariff for a trailer 58 feet long and 11 feet wide is 85 cents per mile, or more than four times the present statutory maximum.

"Beyond that size, the tariffs now provide that the rate increases by 1 cent per mile for each foot of increased length in the trailer beyond 60 feet. Now, that inequity, we feel, is further compounded by the fact that if the employee chose not to live in a trailer, he could have his household goods

moved at Government expense up to a statutory maximum of 7,000 pounds.

"And in most instances, the amount of that allowance would exceed substantially the amount for moving of the house trailer, even the actual cost of moving the house trailer."

The Civil Service Commission representative testified that—

"We found also from some of the information that we gathered that, considering the variety of sizes of trailers, the rates per mile tend to run in the neighborhood of 50 cents when you count in the cost of turnpike tolls, ferry charges, and local charges of the type that have already been referred to.

"So this is a far cry from the 20-cent limit that exists in the present law, if this average is correct. It is reported by a couple of sources. One was the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio as to what they pay their field employees who are so situated, and another is the Morgan Drive-Away Corp., which is one of the large firms that specializes in hauling private trailers.

"Both of them reported a general average of about 50 cents a mile. This is a far cry from the 20-cent limit that exists in the present law. * * *"

The committee noted that this Congress has passed legislation giving relief to military personnel who possess mobile homes: Public Law 87-374. The formula adopted is different from the one proposed in this bill but the objectives are the same. Undoubtedly, this Congress wishes to remove the same inequity for civilian personnel that it has already accomplished for military personnel.

No precise figures are available on the total cost of this legislation on a Government-wide basis but the Bureau of the Budget reported that it did not anticipate any increase in appropriations.

This committee feels it is most likely that Government employees who live in house trailers or mobile homes do so more because of the exigencies of their employment than because they prefer to do so. These are primarily personnel who are stationed in areas remote from large population centers, where housing is difficult to obtain, where transfers are frequent, or where circumstances are far less convenient than for the majority of workers. They certainly deserve our consideration. Only a relatively small number would be affected by this bill and, hence, we see little likelihood of abuses occurring under its provisions.

It should be noted that the bill does not enlarge the class of employees entitled to reimbursement for moving their families and household effects from one post of duty to another. Such reimbursement is now and still would be limited to cases where the transfer is for permanent duty and is in the interest of the Government.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (matter omitted enclosed in brackets, new matter printed in italic, existing law in which no change is reported shown in roman):

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946

AN ACT To authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) under such regulations as the President may prescribe, any civilian officer or employee of the Government who, in the interest of the Government, is transferred from one official station to another, including transfer from one department to another, for permanent duty, shall, except as otherwise provided herein, when authorized or approved by such subordinate official or officials of the department concerned as the head thereof may designate for the purpose, be allowed and paid from Government funds the expenses of travel of himself and the expenses of transportation of his immediate family (or a commutation thereof in accordance with the Act of February 14, 1931) and the expenses of transportation, packing, crating, temporary storage, drayage, and unpacking of his household goods and personal effects (not to exceed seven thousand pounds net weight): *Provided*, That advances of funds may be made to the officer or employee in accordance with said regulations under the same safeguards as are required under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926 (5 U.S.C. 828): *Provided further*, That the allowances herein authorized shall not be applicable to officers and employees transferred in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That no part of such expenses (including those of officers and employees of the Foreign Service, Department of State) shall be allowed or paid from Government funds where the transfer is made primarily for the convenience or benefit of the officer or employee or at his request: *Provided further*, That in case of transfer from one department to another such expenses shall be payable from the funds of the department to which the officer or employee is transferred: *And provided further*, That expenses of travel and transportation in connection with the transfer of officers and employees to posts of duty outside the continental limits of the United States and return therefrom shall be allowed to the same extent and subject to the same limitations prescribed for new appointees under section 7 of this Act.

(b) In lieu of the payment of actual expenses of transportation, packing, crating, temporary storage, drayage, and unpacking of household goods and personal effects, in the case of such transfers between points in continental United States, reimbursement shall be made to the officer or employee on a commuted basis (not to exceed the amount which would be allowable for the authorized weight allowance) at such rates per one hundred pounds as may be fixed by zones in regulations prescribed by the President. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, any civilian officer or employee who

transports a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, for use as a residence and who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of household goods and personal effects under subsection (a) shall be entitled **【to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such transportation】** *in lieu of the transportation to which he would otherwise be entitled under subsection (a) of this section, to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile for transportation of the house trailer or mobile dwelling if such trailer or dwelling is transported by such officer or employee, or, if such trailer or dwelling is not so transported by such officer or employee, to commercial transportation of the house trailer or mobile dwelling, at Government expense, or reimbursement to such officer or employee therefor, including the payment of necessary tolls, charges, and permit fees, except that no payment under this sentence shall exceed the maximum payment to which such officer or employee would otherwise be entitled under this section for transportation and temporary storage of his household goods and personal effects in connection with this transfer.*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

AGENCY COMMENTS

The enactment of this bill was recommended and approved by the Bureau of the Budget, Departments of the Interior, and Agriculture, the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and the General Accounting Office. The reports received from these departments and agencies are contained herein and made a part of this report.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1962.

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for a report on H.R. 10652, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

The existing statutory maximum of 20 cents per mile for transportation of a house trailer is substantially less than the amounts actually charged by commercial concerns under published tariffs approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. In fact, the actual rates charged may be more than double the statutory maximum, depending upon the size and type of trailer involved, routing and other factors. We believe that employees who live in trailers should not be required to finance a substantial part of their moving expenses when they are requested to transfer to new duty stations, especially since employees who live in permanent homes may be reimbursed for moving their household goods in amounts which frequently exceed the cost of moving trailers.

The bill would authorize payment by the Government, or reimbursement to the employee, of the actual costs incurred under applicable tariffs for the transportation of trailers by commercial means. The authorization of actual costs is now more appropriate than a mileage allowance because the tariff rates vary greatly on account of the large differences in the sizes of trailers. A mileage allowance representing average costs would either overcompensate the employee or undercompensate him, depending upon the size of his trailer.

The bill would retain the existing maximum mileage allowance of 20 cents, for application where a trailer is transported by other than commercial means. It would apply usually to small trailers where employees attach them to their privately owned automobiles. By regulation the rate of 11 cents a mile is presently allowed for the trailer in addition to the usual mileage allowance for the automobile. The trailer allowance may be adjusted by regulation, within the 20-cent maximum, to reflect future changes in costs.

In addition, the bill would authorize payment of necessary tolls, charges, and permit fees. These costs are not included in the tariff

charges but are billed separately. They cover such items as bridge and road tolls, ferry and tunnel charges, service charges by carriers for obtaining permits, taxes, and fees for permits to transport trailers of certain sizes through various States. Some of these items also apply where trailers are attached to privately owned automobiles.

The bill also contains a limitation so that the amount authorized may not exceed the maximum amount to which the employee would be entitled for transportation and temporary storage of his household goods and personal effects, if he lived in a permanent home instead of in a trailer. This limitation is now proper because otherwise the amount authorized for large trailers moved commercially would in some instances exceed the allowance available to employees living in permanent homes who are transferred between the same two places.

The bill is a "clean bill" reported by the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, in substitution for H.R. 8049. The bill includes changes recommended by the Bureau of the Budget to the committee. Accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget recommends enactment of H.R. 10652.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1962.

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: This responds to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 10652, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

We recommend the enactment of the bill.

Presently, a Government officer or employee may be reimbursed at a rate "not to exceed 20 cents per mile" for expenses incurred in the transportation of a house trailer or a mobile dwelling when such officer or employee is transferred from one official station to another. H.R. 10652 would remove the present 20-cent-per-mile limitation in cases where the house trailer or mobile dwelling is not transported by the employee, but by commercial means.

Under existing law, employees who are transferred from one station to another are authorized within certain weight limitations to move their household effects at Government expense. The weight allowances usually are adequate for the normal household effects. Thus, the shipment involves no out-of-pocket expense to the employee.

Employees who live in house trailers or other mobile homes (usually they have no recourse because of isolation and lack of housing) do not have a similar benefit of full payment for transportation of household effects. They are limited to a 20-cents-per-mile reimbursement where the house trailer is transported by commercial hauler. Any amount paid commercial haulers over and above this allowance must be absorbed by the employee.

The Bonneville Power Administration of this Department has reported to us that rates in the Pacific Northwest for the transportation of house trailers range from 25 cents to 60 cents per mile, depending on the size of the trailer. To these basic rates other charges are added, such as \$10 to \$20 for hookup, 10 cents per mile for deadheading the towing tractor back to its point of origin, and 15 cents per mile for a pilot car when one is required by State highway regulations. Accordingly, employees of the Bonneville Power Administration usually cannot recover the actual cost of moving house trailers on changes of official station in the Pacific Northwest. We presume that transportation rates and charges in one section of the country would generally reflect the rates and charges made by the industry nationally.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1962.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of April 6, 1962, requesting our comments on H.R. 10652, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

This Department favors enactment of the bill. The present maximum rate of 20 cents per mile is too low to permit reasonable reimbursement to employees for costs of moving house trailers used as residences, when required to change official stations. A recent survey by this Department of employee costs of transporting house trailers by commercial haulers supports this conclusion. The survey revealed that in practically all cases, the present allowable rate of 20 cents per mile was substantially under the rates paid by the employee. Rates paid were found to vary from 17 to 75 cents per mile, depending upon length, width, and weight of the trailer, distance traveled, nature of terrain (mountainous or flat), and State or States involved.

H.R. 10652 is a clean bill in lieu of H.R. 8049 and is in accord with our recommendations to the House Committee on Government Operations in respect to the former bill. Although the proposed legislation would involve some additional costs, it would not necessitate additional appropriations to this Department.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, *Secretary.*

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1962.

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your letter of April 6, 1962, requesting a report on H.R. 10652, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

H.R. 10652 would remove the statutory ceiling of 20-cents-per-mile allowance for transporting house trailers or mobile dwellings by civilian employees upon their transfer from one official station to another. Under the bill, the employee may be reimbursed the actual cost of moving the trailer if it is moved by a commercial firm. However, these payments may not exceed the maximum to which the employee would be entitled under existing law for movement of his household and personal effects. Further, the present limitation of 20 cents per mile would remain if the employee chose to move the trailer himself.

The Civil Service Commission heartily endorses H.R. 10652, and recommends its enactment both as a matter of equity for employees and as a matter of good administrative practice for Government.

A survey of about 15,000 of Federal Aviation Agency's 40,000 employees disclosed that, in 1960, 49 employees who were relocated for the convenience of the Government arranged for movement of their house trailers. Thirty-four of these forty-nine transferees hired a commercial transporter to move the trailer to the new duty station. Information furnished by the 49 employees shows that the Federal Government reimbursed these employees for the movement of their trailers a total of \$4,569. The information also shows, however, that the moves cost the employees an additional \$4,466, which was not reimbursable, or an average net loss of over \$90 per move.

The Mobile Housing Carrier Conference reports that the average size house trailer today is of the following dimensions:

Height: 11 feet, 6 inches.

Weight: 9,500 to 10,500 pounds.

Length: 43 to 45 feet.

Width: 10 feet.

Growth in the size of trailers makes it increasingly impractical to move them with private passenger vehicles and has made obsolete any unstated assumption in payment plans that this would be the normal method. The increasing use of the more accurate name "mobile home" in place of "trailer" reflects this development.

Tariff rates established by the large commercial transporters and on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission for moving a trailer of this size average 41 cents per mile. This does not include other extra charges paid directly by the Federal employee. These include bridge, road, and turnpike tolls, ferry and tunnel charges, taxes, permits, cost of securing permits (now required in 40 States), cost for escort vehicles required by some States, and personal insurance on trailer and its contents for the trip. With these additional charges, the average rate to move the average size trailer, according to Morgan Driveaway, Inc. (one of three large firms specializing in this business), becomes 50

cents per mile. Standard Oil Co. of Ohio reports that they pay their field employees who move by trailers in the neighborhood of 50 cents per mile.

Many Federal employees reside in house trailers through choice. However, the Federal service employs civilians in many positions where it has been found most convenient for all concerned for the employee and his family to reside in a house trailer. These include, for example, construction inspectors and engineers with the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Public Roads, and Bureau of Reclamation; electronics technicians of Weather Bureau and Federal Aviation Agency who install and repair electronic equipment at outlying and isolated locations; field survey parties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and scientific, technical, and other Defense Department employees residing in trailers at field testing stations and laboratories, and at missile bases.

Inadequate allowances for movement of trailers are likely to have an adverse effect on the recruiting and retention of employees in all governmental units whose activities require a very mobile work force.

We feel that any increased cost of allowances for movement of house trailers would be greatly, if not completely, offset by—

- (1) A more mobile and flexible work force;
- (2) A more satisfied group of employees;
- (3) Less turnover, with resulting savings in recruitment and training costs;
- (4) Less need to provide Government living quarters at temporary sites;
- (5) Less occasion to make more expensive payments for movement of household goods for employees who dispose of their trailers, if their work situation permits, rather than continue to absorb losses.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr., *Chairman.*

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 12, 1962.

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of April 6, 1962, requests our comments on H.R. 10652, which passed the House of Representatives on April 2, 1962.

The bill would amend section 1 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-1) to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

The pertinent provision of 5 U.S.C. 73b-1, now provides as follows:

"* * * Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, any civilian officer or employee who transports a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, for use as a residence and who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of household goods and personal effects under subsection (a) of this section shall be entitled to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such transportation."

The effect of the proposed amendment to the above-quoted provision of law would be to authorize an employee to recover from the Government (or the Government to pay initially) the actual cost of the shipment by commercial means of a trailer or mobile dwelling, including necessary tolls, charges and permit fees, but not in excess of what he otherwise would be entitled to (7,000 pounds net weight) for transportation of his household goods and personal effects in connection with a transfer of official station.

For the reasons set forth in House Report 1487, dated March 23, 1962, to accompany H.R. 10652, we believe the proposed legislation has considerable merit. Therefore, we recommend enactment thereof. Compare Public Law 87-374, approved October 4, 1961.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

APPENDIX

Public Law 87-374

87th Congress, H.R. 2732

October 4, 1961

AN ACT

To amend section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the Secretaries concerned to prescribe a reasonable monetary allowance for the transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the twelfth sentence of section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U.S.C. 253(c)) is amended to read as follows: "Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned and in lieu of transportation of baggage and household effects or payment of a dislocation allowance, a member of the uniformed services, or in the case of his death his dependents, who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of baggage and household goods under this section, may transport a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States for use as a residence by one of the following means—

"(1) transport the trailer or dwelling and receive a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation at a rate to be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned (but not to exceed twenty cents per mile);

"(2) deliver the trailer or dwelling to the Government for transportation by commercial means; or

"(3) transport the trailer or dwelling by commercial means and be reimbursed by the Government subject to such rates as may be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned;

Provided, That the cost of transportation under clause (2) or the reimbursement under clause (3) may not exceed (A) the current average cost for the commercial transportation of a house trailer or mobile dwelling, (B) 36 cents per mile, or (C) the cost of transporting the baggage and household effects of the member or his dependents plus the dislocation allowance authorized in this section, whichever of (A), (B) or (C) is the lesser: *And provided further,* That any payment authorized by this section may be made in advance of the transportation concerned."

Approved October 4, 1961.

Calendar No. 2147

87TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 10652

[Report No. 2185]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 3, 1962

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Government Operations

SEPTEMBER 28, 1962

Reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, without amendment

AN ACT

To amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the last sentence of subsection (b) of the first section
4 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C.
5 73b-1) is amended by striking out “to a reasonable allow-
6 ance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such trans-
7 portation” and inserting in lieu thereof, “in lieu of the
8 transportation to which he would otherwise be entitled under

1 subsection (a) of this section, to a reasonable allowance, not
2 to exceed 20 cents per mile for transportation of the house
3 trailer or mobile dwelling if such trailer or dwelling is trans-
4 ported by such officer or employee, or, if such trailer or
5 dwelling is not so transported by such officer or employee, to
6 commercial transportation of the house trailer or mobile
7 dwelling, at Government expense, or reimbursement to such
8 officer or employee therefor, including the payment of neces-
9 sary tolls, charges, and permit fees, except that no payment
10 under this sentence shall exceed the maximum payment to
11 which such officer or employee would otherwise be entitled
12 under this section for transportation and temporary storage
13 of his household goods and personal effects in connection with
14 this transfer”.

Passed the House of Representatives April 2, 1962.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

87TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 10652

[Report No. 2185]

AN ACT

To amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

APRIL 3, 1962

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Government Operations

SEPTEMBER 28, 1962

Reported without amendment

Foreign Aid Programs." p. 19997

24. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield stated that the foreign aid appropriation bill will be considered next Mon., Oct. 1, following by consideration of the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill, the public works appropriation bill, and the roads bill, and that the conference report on the tax bill will probably be considered Wed., and the supplemental appropriation bill will probably be considered on Thurs. pp. 20011-3

SENATE - Sept. 29

25. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 12900. pp. 20114, 20115, 20118-43, 20149, 20156, 20168-237
26. STATE-COMMERCE-JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Sen. Smathers submitted notice that he will move to suspend the rules on this bill, H. R. 12580, for the purpose of proposing amendments to it. pp. 20102-9
27. FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Sens. Smathers and Hayden submitted notices that they will move to suspend the rules on this bill, H. R. 13175, for the purpose of proposing amendments to it. p. 20109
28. WATER POLLUTION. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10617, providing that the U. S. district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain cases involving pollution of interstate river systems, and providing for the venue thereof (S. Rept. 2211). p. 20102
29. EDUCATION. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendment S. 3477, to promote the security and welfare of the people of the U. S. by providing for a program to assist the several states in further developing their programs of general university extension education (S. Rept. 2204). p. 20102
30. PERSONNEL. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8140, to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest (S. Rept. 2213). p. 20102

Passed without amendment H. R. 10652, to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another so as to provide that the employee may be reimbursed the actual cost of moving the trailer if it is moved by a commercial firm or his agency contracts to move it. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 20153

31. MINERALS. Passed as reported H. R. 11049, to provide for the relief of certain oil and gas lessees under the Mineral Leasing Act. pp. 20149-51
32. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Passed without amendment H. R. 11378, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to schools for the mentally retarded, schools for the physically handicapped, educational television stations, and public libraries. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 20153-4
33. ADJOURNED until Mon. Oct. 1. p. 20237

Sept 29, 1962

forestry research by providing grants and other assistance for forestry research to land-grant colleges and universities or agricultural experiment stations, was passed as reported on Sept. 25, and passed the bill without amendment. (pp. 20021-3) This bill will now be sent to the President. Rejected the committee amendments which would have made all colleges and universities offering graduate training in the sciences basic to forestry and having forestry schools eligible for grants under the bill without regard to whether they are State supported. (p. 20023)

13. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration with amendments this bill, H. R. 12580. p. D907
14. BUDGETING. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H.R. 10613, to repeal subsection (d) of Sec. 16 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 which requires detailed budget estimates for appropriations to be used for purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles or for purchase, maintenance, or operation of aircraft (S. Rept. 2184). p. 19997
15. PERSONNEL. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H.R. 10652, to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another (S. Rept. 2185). p. 19997
 Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 12180, to extend until July 1, 1964, the existing provisions of law permitting the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the U. S. under Government orders. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 20082
16. MINERALS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 1696, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of federally-owned lands for the purpose of locating strategic minerals (S. Rept. 2188). p. 19997
17. D. C. APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Passed as reported this bill, H. R. 12276. Conferees were appointed. pp. 20025-78
18. DRUGS. Conferees were appointed on S. 1552, the proposed Drug Industry Act of 1962. House conferees have already been appointed. pp. 20078-82
19. WILDERNESS PRESERVATION. Sen. Humphrey defended the wilderness preservation bill as passed by the Senate and urged the House to take action on the measure this session of Congress. pp. 20097-9
20. RECLAMATION. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 1060, to authorize the construction of the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Wash. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 20085-6
21. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Jackson defended the provisions of S. 3153, to define the primary marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration, as passed by the Senate Aug. 8. pp. 20086-8
22. PEACE CORPS. Sen. Humphrey commended the work of the Peace Corps on its first anniversary. pp. 20094-7
23. FOREIGN AID. The Rules and Administration Committee reported a resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document a study, "United States Private

MORE REASONABLE ALLOWANCE FOR TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSE TRAILERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2147, H.R. 10652.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10652) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 2185), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would amend section 1 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-1) to provide for a more reasonable allowance for the transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government when they are transferred from one official station to another.

The bill would retain the present limitation of 20 cents per mile when an employee chooses to move the trailer himself. It provides, however, that if his mobile home is moved by a commercial firm, or is moved by his department or agency, the actual cost thereof may be paid by the Federal Government, in which event, the latter payments may not exceed the maximum to which the employee would be entitled under existing law for movement of his household and personal effects.

BACKGROUND

The House Committee on Government Operations in its report on the bill (H. Rept. 1487), sets forth the following background and justification for the proposed legislation, which is made a part of this report:

This bill is designed to remove an inequity in the law providing for the transportation of house trailers and mobile homes. Under the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-1) the Government is authorized to provide employees who possess such trailers an allowance up to 20 cents per mile for their transportation from one official station to another. House trailers have grown in size and weight in recent years and many of them are too large or too heavy to be moved by being attached to a passenger car. Trucks are required and commercial firms do most of the moving. Rates for transporting mobile homes across State lines are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Because of the increase in size, many communities require a police escort which must be paid for and there are other fees and tolls which add to the expense.

Evidence was given the committee that the cost of moving the larger trailers varied anywhere from 29 to 85 cents per mile. In order to move his home when he is transferred by the Government an employee is required, because of the 20-cent-per-mile limitation, to pay the excess out of his own pocket.

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization at which time representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission were present and supported the bill.

During his testimony the Budget Bureau representative stated:

"We are very much in favor of the bill. We believe the bill is necessary. Employees are being required to pay a substantial portion of the cost of transporting their house trailers. At present, the minimum cost under ICC-approved tariffs for the smallest kind of a trailer is 29 cents per mile.

"That is 9 cents above the present statutory maximum. Then, in addition to that, as the previous witness pointed out, the employee must pay State permit fees which vary by the States. They are \$11 in some instances.

"The Department of Defense estimates that the average of those fees is about \$30 per move. As I say, that is for the smallest kind of trailer. Trailers can be rather large now. And the ICC-approved tariff for a trailer 58 feet long and 11 feet wide is 85 cents per mile, or more than four times the present statutory maximum.

"Beyond that size, the tariffs now provide that the rate increases by 1 cent per mile for each foot of increased length in the trailer beyond 60 feet. Now, that inequity, we feel, is further compounded by the fact that if the employee chose not to live in a trailer, he could have his household goods moved at Government expense up to a statutory maximum of 7,000 pounds.

"And in most instances, the amount of that allowance would exceed substantially the amount for moving of the house trailer, even the actual cost of moving the house trailer."

The Civil Service Commission representative testified that—

"We found also from some of the information that we gathered that, considering the variety of sizes of trailers, the rates per mile tend to run in the neighborhood of 50 cents when you count in the cost of turnpike tolls, ferry charges, and local charges of the type that have already been referred to.

"So this is a far cry from the 20-cent limit that exists in the present law, if this average is correct. It is reported by a couple of sources. One was the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio as to what they pay their field employees who are so situated, and another is the Morgan Drive-Away Corp., which is one of the large firms that specializes in hauling private trailers.

"Both of them reported a general average of about 50 cents a mile. This is a far cry from the 20-cent limit that exists in the present law. * * *

The committee noted that this Congress has passed legislation giving relief to military personnel who possess mobile homes: Public Law 87-374. The formula adopted is different from the one proposed in this bill but the objectives are the same. Undoubtedly, this Congress wishes to remove the same inequity for civilian personnel that it has already accomplished for military personnel.

No precise figures are available on the total cost of this legislation on a Government-wide basis but the Bureau of the Budget reported that it did not anticipate any increase in appropriations.

This committee feels it is most likely that Government employees who live in house trailers or mobile homes do so more because of the exigencies of their employment than because they prefer to do so. These are primarily personnel who are stationed in areas remote from large population centers, where housing is difficult to obtain, where transfers are frequent, or where circumstances are far less convenient than for the majority of workers. They certainly deserve our con-

sideration. Only a relatively small number would be affected by this bill and, hence, we see little likelihood of abuses occurring under its provisions.

It should be noted that the bill does not enlarge the class of employees entitled to reimbursement for moving their families and household effects from one post of duty to another. Such reimbursement is now and still would be limited to cases where the transfer is for permanent duty and is in the interest of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10652) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DONATIONS OF SURPLUS PERSONAL PROPERTY TO SCHOOLS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2148, H.R. 11378.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11378) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1940, so as to permit donations of surplus personal property to schools for the mentally retarded, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 2186), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose, background, and justification for enactment of this bill is found in House Report No. 2433, and is made a part of this report as follows:

"The purpose of the bill is to clarify certain inconsistencies in existing legislation, eliminate inequities in the operation of the donable surplus property program, and give recognition to recent program developments.

"Under present law, schools for the mentally retarded and schools for the physically handicapped conduct special classes and courses and serve a genuine educational and training service but are not technically eligible to receive surplus personal property since they do not meet the definition of schools, colleges, universities, and other educational institutions as established by authorized accrediting bodies.

"Public libraries, though widely recognized as being educational institutions and eligible to receive surplus real property under section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484), have not been considered eligible to receive surplus personal property under section 203(j) of the same act. This anomaly in the legislation would be removed by enactment of H.R. 11378.

Educational television and radio stations which are owned and operated by eligible

schools, colleges, and universities have been receiving surplus personal property. Others, though serving educational purposes, have not been eligible. Under the proposed amendment, radio and television stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission as educational radio or educational television stations, would be eligible to receive surplus personal property, provided they meet established standards and procedures.

It should be emphasized that H.R. 11378 does not add new categories of donees but merely clarifies the status of certain types of institutions within the educational category.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as the administrator of the donable surplus property program has assured the committee that he will prescribe strict standards of eligibility for the additional donees authorized by this bill in order that bona fide institutions only will qualify for surplus personal property.

AGENCY COMMENTS

Enactment of the subject bill was recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget, General Services Administration, and the General Accounting Office. The reports and comments from these agencies on S. 2119 and related measures follow:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 11378) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF TITLE II, NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2153, S. 3326.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3326) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to extend the provisions of title II relating to cancellation of loans under such title to teachers in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 2190), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended, presently provides that not to exceed 50 percent of a National Defense Education Act loan advanced to a student who becomes a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school can be canceled at a rate of 10 percent of the balance (including interest) outstanding on

the first day of teaching for each academic year of service.

S. 3326, if enacted, would extend this principle to an individual who enters on a teaching career in a private nonprofit elementary or secondary school or who engages in teaching at an institution of higher education.

A similar amendment was considered and adopted by the committee in S. 2345 of the 87th Congress. The committee, in view of the legislative status of that bill, is of the view that this particular amendment to title II of the National Defense Education Act, which is of benefit to an individual, and which would provide a needed incentive to staff all segments of American education at all levels is justified.

The continuing shortage of teachers extends to private nonprofit as well as to public schools and to all levels of our educational system and this amendment would encourage college students to consider careers in college and university teaching in all type of schools and at all levels.

The report of the consultants to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the U.S. Commissioner of Education on Areas Related to the National Defense Education Act of 1958, released January 12, 1961, as shown on page 569 of the printed hearings of May 12 and 13, 1961, on the National Defense Education Act, recommends "that the present loan forgiveness feature for public elementary and secondary teachers be extended to all school and college teachers."

Support for the proposed amendment was given by the Commissioner of Education in testimony which may be found on page 21 of the printed hearings of May 12 and 13, 1961, in these words:

"It is further proposed that the provisions for forgiveness of up to one-half of the loan for borrowers who become teachers in public elementary and secondary schools be extended to include also borrowers who become teachers in our colleges and universities."

And on page 30 under the heading, "Summary of Accomplishments Under the National Defense Education Act and Proposals for Amendment and Extension Thereof—Title II—Student Loan Program," there may be found the recommendation:

"3. PARTIAL CANCELLATION OF LOANS FOR COLLEGE TEACHING

"The present and prospective shortage of teachers extends to all educational levels—elementary, secondary, and higher. Allowing 50-percent cancellation of loan principal and interest for elementary and secondary public school teaching service is a significant incentive to students to enter teaching at those levels. Extension of the cancellation privilege to teachers in higher education institutions similarly would serve as incentive for students considering various careers. Looking at the teacher shortage problem as a whole, there is no reason to distinguish in the loan program between teaching in elementary and secondary schools and teaching in colleges and universities."

Testimony in support of the proposed amendment was also given by representatives of the National Society of Professional Engineers (p. 167 of the May 12 and 13, 1961, printed hearings); the American Council of Learned Societies (ibid. p., 238); the National Catholic Welfare Conference (ibid., p. 238); the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges (ibid., p. 365); the American Council on Education; the American Association of Junior Colleges; the Association for Higher Education; the National Education Association and the Association of American Colleges (ibid., p. 391); and the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (ibid., p. 404).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no

amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3326) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205(b) (3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "elementary or secondary school in a State" and inserting in lieu thereof "or private nonprofit elementary or secondary school in a State, or in an institution of higher education".

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senate has passed S. 3326. This bill, if passed by the other House, and enacted, will right a wrong that has done real disservice to the cause of education throughout the Nation. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provided up to 50 percent forgiveness on student loans for those who went on to a career of teaching in public schools. The same privilege was not extended to those who went on to teach in private schools or institutions of higher learning, even though the need for qualified teachers there is equally great.

The passage of this bill is a worthwhile first step toward removing discrimination in education and recognizing the contributions of all of our teachers toward the education of our Nation's youth.

I am most hopeful that the House of Representatives will act quickly to give its approval to this important and long overdue measure, which I am very glad to have cosponsored here in the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933 AND FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2156, House bill 13044.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13044) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 and the Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, has the bill been cleared with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that the bill has been cleared. I notice that the Senator from Illinois did have his name on it for the purposes of holding the bill. It has apparently been cleared with him.

Did the Senator from Alabama have a comment to make?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I was about to say that I did not know what steps had been taken by the Policy Committee. But, as the Senator from Wisconsin knows, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] did not interpose any objection to the bill in the committee, and the bill was left open until midnight



Public Law 87-776
87th Congress, H. R. 10652
October 9, 1962

An Act

76 STAT. 777.

To amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of subsection (b) of the first section of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-1) is amended by striking out "to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, in lieu of such transportation" and inserting in lieu thereof, "in lieu of the transportation to which he would otherwise be entitled under subsection (a) of this section, to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile for transportation of the house trailer or mobile dwelling if such trailer or dwelling is transported by such officer or employee, or, if such trailer or dwelling is not so transported by such officer or employee, to commercial transportation of the house trailer or mobile dwelling, at Government expense, or reimbursement to such officer or employee therefor, including the payment of necessary tolls, charges, and permit fees, except that no payment under this sentence shall exceed the maximum payment to which such officer or employee would otherwise be entitled under this section for transportation and temporary storage of his household goods and personal effects in connection with this transfer".

Administrative
Expenses Act of
1946, amendment.
60 Stat. 806;
72 Stat. 14.

Approved October 9, 1962.

